



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

100. 1026 20. 399
-41
23

THE
ECCLESIASTIC.

VOLUME XXV.
JANUARY TO DECEMBER, MDCCCLXIII.

//.

LONDON:
JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,
AND NEW BOND STREET.
OXFORD: J. H. AND JAMES PARKER; A. R. MOWBRAY.
CAMBRIDGE: HALL AND SON. DERBY: J. AND C. MOZLEY.
MDCCCLXIII.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS AND SON,
ALDERSGATE STREET.



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Acts of the Apostles	112
Aitken's (Mr.) Theory of Justification	533
Alexander Smith's Essays	427
Antiphons and Introits	512
Boyle (Mr.) on the Book of Daniel	305
Bright's Sermons of S. Leo	45
Bromby's Church Student's Manual	379
Clergy Relief	33
Clerical Subscription	293
Condition of Souls in the Intermediate State	411
Correspondence	148, 196, 292, 388, 531, 590
Daily Service, The	573
De Burgh's Donnellan Lectures	459
Declaration on Kneeling	324
Dixon's Fasti Eboracenses	485
Döllinger on the Gentile and the Jew	99
Freeman's Principles of Divine Service	69
Forbes (Mr.) on the English Prayer Book	405
Gladstone (Mr.), his Constituency and Politics	235
Harvest Celebrations	477, 531
Heliotropium of Drexelius	175
Hymns for the Church	446
Indelibility of Orders	133
Justification by Faith	149
Keble's Life of Bishop Wilson	245
Kingsley's Gospel of the Pentateuch	559
Letter from the Reviewer of Stuart on Low Masses	526
Life of Savonarola	389
Literary History of the Scotch Liturgy	320
Littledale on the Mixed Chalice	324
Longfellow's New Volume	545
Martyrdom of S. Ignatius	346
Monro's Pastoral Life	51
Moore's (Mr. D.) Lenten Sermon at Oxford	241
Morison's Life and Times of S. Bernard	165, 260
Obituary Notice of Mr. Masters	436
Offices of the Holy Eastern Church	227
Owen's Pilgrimage to Rome	232
Parish Visiting	313
Position of the Papacy in Christendom	22

	PAGE
Recent Works on the Passion	179
Religious Communities of Women from the time of S. Benedict	1
Rites of Burial	371
Sermons by a Northamptonshire Rector	499
S. Francis Xavier	77
S. George the Martyr and George the Arian	154
Sharpe's Egyptian Mythology	361
Shutte's Life of the Bishop of Exeter	125
Some of the Social and Moral Characteristics of the West Riding	61
Stanley (Dr.) on the Bible	163
Stanley's (Dr.) Lectures on the Eastern Church	197
Stanley's (Dr.) Lectures on the Jewish Church	274
Steadfastness	184
Stuart on Low Masses	437, 526
Thrupp on the Song of Songs	341, 416
Ulrich von Hutten	521
Undogmatic Christianity	285
Work of the Church	507

INDEX OF BOOKS

REVIEWED OR NOTICED.

	PAGE		PAGE
Ackworth's (Rev. W.) Church Rates and the Liberation Society	292	Canterbury's (Dean of) English New Testament	387
Acts of the Apostles	112	Canterbury's (Dean of) Sermon on the Royal Wedding	195
Adams' (Rev. W.) Silvio	50	Caparn's (Mr.) Counsels and Warnings	292
Aitken's (Rev. R.) Letters for Non-conformists on the Prayer Book	533	Carter's (Rev. T. T.) Consecration Festival Sermon	387
Alford's (Dean) English New Testament	387	Carter's (Rev. T. T.) Family Prayers	98
Alford's (Dean) Sermon on the Royal Wedding	195	Carter's (Rev. T. T.) Lectures on the Passion	179
Altar Manual	97	Catechism on the Holy Communion	98
Anselm's Cur Deus Homo	387	Catechism on Confirmation	386
Are the Anglican Orders Valid?	95	Chapters on Plants; or, Marion's Herbal	589
Bangor's (Bishop of) Charge	388	Chaufour-Kestner's Ulrich von Hutten	521
Beresford Hope's (Mr.) Social Influence of the Prayer Book	290	Choir and Musical Record	435
Black's (Rev. C. J.) Little Primer	291	Chope's (Rev. R. R.) Prayer Book Noted	289
Borovnitsky's Origin of the Roman Liturgy	530	Christmas Tales	588
Bouverie's (Mr.) Bill for Clergy Relief	33	Church of the People	98
Boyle's (W. R. A.) Inspiration of the Book of Daniel	305	Church Review	98
Brechin's (Bishop of) Sermons on the Grace of God	145	Church Times	195
Bright's (Rev. W.) Sermons of S. Leo	45	Churchman's Companion	98
Bromby's (Rev. C. H.) Church Student's Manual	379	Colenso's (Bishop) Pentateuch and Book of Joshua	49
Brother and Sister	97	Communion Office for the Scotch Church	320
Brown's (Rev. G. J.) Commentary on S. John	387	Complaint, the, a Dialogue	98
		Coxe's (Archdeacon) Free Inquiry	386

	PAGE
Dalton's (Rev. H.) What is the Church?	148
Darnell's Translation of Döllinger	99
De Burgh's (Dr.) Messianic Prophecies of Isaiah	459
De Burgh's (Dr.) Early Prophecies of a Redeemer	459
Disraeli's (Mr.) Speech on the Prospects and Duty of the Church	98
Dixon's Fasti Eboracenses	485
Döllinger's Church and the Churches	22
Döllinger's Gentile and Jew	99
Drexelius' (Jeremy) Heliotropium	175
Durham University, pamphlet on	196
Duty of a Christian as to his Income	148
Edward VI.'s First Liturgy	435
English Church Union Kalendar	50
English's (W.) Essay on Man	432
Espin's (Rev. T. E.) Sermon on Want of Clergy	194
Everlasting Hills	147
Fagan's Ancient Carol	589
Forbes (G. H.), Doctrinal Errors and Practical Scandals	405
Foundling, the	291
Freeman's (Rev. P.) Principles of Divine Service	69
George Turner	147
Godfray's (Dr.) Du Conflit entre le Pape et l'Italie	531
Goodman's (Margaret) Sisterhoods in the Church of England	144
Grueber's (Rev. C. S.) Letter on Burial Service	588
Gurney's (Rev. J. H.) Sermons on the Acts	112
Gutch's (Rev. C.) Sermon on the Duties of Lent	243
Harold, a Ghost Story	147
Helmores' (Rev. T.) S. Mark's Chant Book	381
Help and Comfort for the Sick Poor	298
High Church Doctrines Examined	98
Holden's (Rev. G.) Ordinance of Preaching	288
Holiday Tales	484
Holme's (Rev. C.) Annotations on S. Mark	484
Holy Year, the	446
Horner's (L.) Translation of Villari	389
Houghton's (Rev. W.) Essays on Rationalism	388
How should we treat our servants?	530
Huntington's (Rev. G.) Church's Work in large towns	507
Hyde's (Mr.) Catechist's Easy Explanation	291
Ingle's (Mr.) Sermon on the Prince of Wales' Marriage	195
Irons' (Dr.) Letter on the Prayer Book and Articles	382

	PAGE
Juke's (Andrew) Letter on Subscription	293
Kalendar of the Imitation	147
Kalendar for the Scotch Church	96
Keble's (Rev. J.) Life of Bishop Wilson	245
Kennedy's (Dr.) Hymnologia Christiana	147
Kingley's (Rev. C.) Gospel of the Pentateuch	559
Littledale's (Dr.) Offices of the Eastern Church	227
Littledale's (Dr.) Letter on the Mixed Chalice	334
Little Nelly	147
Little People	97
Longfellow's Tales of a Wayside Inn	545
Longsdon's (Mr.) Remarks on the Management of the S. P. C. K.	589
Lucy and Christian Wainwright	291
MacCabe's Translation of Döllinger	22
Malan's (Rev. S. C.) Meditations on the Passion	179
Malan's (Rev. S. C.) Pocket Book of Prayers	179
Malan's (Rev. S. C.) Preparation for Holy Communion	435
Manchester Church Congress	507
Marshall's (T. W.) Christian Missions	77
Memoir of Stafford Brown	337
Minnie's Birthday	196
Monro's (Rev. E.) Eustace	435
Monro's (Rev. E.) Pastoral Life	51
Monsell's (Dr.) Paper on Sisterhoods	435
Monsell's (Dr.) Hymns of Love and Praise	483
Monthly Packet	98
Monthly Reading	195
Moore's (Rev. D.) Lenten Sermon at Oxford	241
Moreton's (Rev. J.) Life and Work in Newfoundland	385
Morison's (J. C.) Life of S. Bernard	165, 261
Mozley's (Rev. J. B.) Letter on Subscription	293
Neale's (Dr.) Mediæval Hymns and Sequences	97
Neale's (Dr.) Essays on Liturgiology	147
Oldknow's (Dr.) Church Union Sermon	292
Owen's (Rev. R.) Pilgrimage to Rome	232
Oxford's (Bp. of) Sermons before the University	195
Parochial Magazine	98
Pearson's (Mr. C. B.) Latin Hymns	148
Peile's (Dr.) Sermon	196
Penny Post	98

	PAGE		PAGE
Perry's (Rev. T. W.) Analogies between the Human and the Mystical Body	583	Stanley's (Dr.) Letter on Subscription	293
Perry's (Rev. T. W.) Historical Considerations	324	Stanley's (Dr.) Lectures on the Jewish Church	274
Phillipps' (Rev. E. F. M.) Ordinances of Spiritual Worship	337	Stracey's (W. J.) Paper on Sisterhoods	435
Pleasant Hours	98	Stuart's (Rev. E.) Thoughts on Low Masses	437
Popoff's (B.) Origin of the Roman Liturgy	530	Thanksgiving for Harvest	477
Power's (Rev. P. B.) Talking Fire-irons	387	Thomas (W. C.) Holiness of Beauty	192
Primer, the	484	Thornton's (Rev. T.) Life of Betty Adamson	243
Pye's (Rev. H. J.) Tract, the Claims of the Church of Rome	589	Thrupp (Rev. J. F.) on the Song of Songs	341, 416
Raine's Fasti Eboracenses	485	Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature	154
Randall's (Rev. R. W.) Sermon	96	Union Review	195
Rice's (Rev. C. H.) Sermon preached at S. Columba's College, Ireland	587	Venn's (H.) Missionary Life of Xavier	77
Ridley's Sermons in plain language	435	Verdict of the Nonconformists	96
Rust's (Rev. C.) Tract on the Creeds	244	Village Story for Village Maidens	387
Scripture Record of the Life and Times of Samuel the Prophet	586	Village Sermons by a Northamptonshire Rector	499
Sharpe's (S.) Egyptian Mythology	361	Villari's (P.) History of Savonarola	389
Shirley's (Rev. W. W.) Undogmatic Christianity	285	We all do fade as a leaf	147
Shipley's (Rev. O.) Lyra Eucharistica	434	Week of Short Prayers	484
Shipley's (Rev. O.) Divine Liturgy	97	Westlake's (Mr.) Hymns and Sacred Songs	484
Short's Catechism on Baptismal Vow and Confirmation	292	Willie Morgan	147
Shutte's (Rev. R. N.) Life of the Bishop of Exeter	125	Will ye also go away?	531
Shutte's (Rev. R. N.) Translation of Drexelius	175	Wilson's (Rev. P. S.) Sermon on Daily Service	243
Sinclair's (Archdeacon) Reason and Faith	530	Whitehead's (Rev. H.) Sermons for Saints' Days	587
Sketch of the Life of John Lee	291	Women Labouring in the Lord	589
Smith's (Alexander) Dreamthorp	427	Word to all on Christmas Day	588
Smith's (E. J.) Two Letters	530	Words of the Introits	512
Spranger's Lectures on Genesis	338	Wroth's (Mr.) Church Union Sermon	292
St. John's (S.) Life in the Forests	387	Yonge's (Miss) Countess Kate	96
Stanley's (Dr.) Sermons on the Bible	163	Yonge's (Miss) Conversations on the Catechism	340
Stanley's (Dr.) Lectures on the Eastern Church	197	Young's (A.) Ulrich von Hutten	521
		Young's (J. R.) Science and Scripture	383

THE ECCLESIASTIC.

THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES OF WOMEN FROM THE TIME OF S. BENEDICT.

THE investigation of the position and discipline of the communities of women in the Early Church is, contrary to what might be supposed, attended with fewer difficulties than those which beset the inquirer who seeks for information touching the period which lies between the reform of S. Benedict and that of the Council of Trent. The reasons for this apparent paradox are easily assigned. In the earlier period there are practically only two great bodies to be examined—the Eastern Church (subdivided into Syro-Greek and Egyptian,) and the Western (subdivided into Italic and African.) Each of these had its special characteristics which distinguished it from the other, but within its own pale it was almost perfectly homogeneous. In the next place, the Councils and Synods of the first five centuries were much less local in their operations than those of later times, and, save in the case of those of the crotchety Church of Carthage, were generally of accord in practical as well as in dogmatic questions. Finally, the great theologians and ecclesiastical historians, from whom our materials are derived, were for the most part men occupying prominent public positions, and were as familiar, thanks to the unity of the civil system of the Empire, with what passed in its most distant frontiers, as with the events occurring in Constantinople, Alexandria, or Milan. But with the break up of the Western Empire on the one hand, and the crumbling of the Eastern outworks even anterior to the advent of Islam, all this state of things was altered. The interval which lies between the first partition of Roman Europe amongst its Emperors, and the ultimate rise of the family of kingdoms, was not favourable to harmonious intercourse. The idea of National Churches and National Councils at once began to usurp the place of the Ecumenical theory, and the first land to sever itself in this way from the great sodality of Christendom was Spain, and she was followed in rapid succession by Burgundy,

VOL. XXV.—JANUARY, 1863.

B

Aquitaine, and Lombardy. It needed but a little time for England, now the type of ultra-nationalism in religion, to join the movement, which she alone was to carry to its logical issue.

Hence arose infinite varieties of discipline and usage, most of them, it is true, on points of lesser moment, but constituting in the aggregate no small amount of divergence. Next, for the world-wide reputation and influence of men like SS. Athanasius, Jerome, Augustine, Basil, and Leo, we find the limits of the cloister often bounding the horizon of the greatest Christian writers. The fame of some eminent teacher, a Columbanus, an Alcuin, or an Anselm, might indeed spread widely and draw crowds of listening disciples; but so far as ecclesiastical history and discipline are concerned, the works of these and other distinguished men scarcely belong to the Church Universal, but rather to the particular branch of it which their lives adorned. The historians are rarely more than the annalists of a single land, more often of a single monastery, and the student who seeks to obtain at first hand a view of the whole area which they embrace, must pore over countless volumes, whose prolixity and narrow scope make him think with regret of the terse and comprehensive summaries of Eusebius and Sozomen.

It is obvious that these difficulties, which tell so much even on the broad facts of history, must especially affect our means of acquiring knowledge of the internal discipline of the convents of the West. So far as communities of men are concerned, there is no lack of materials, for almost every abbey of note had its annalist, and many of those who began as simple monks filled the highest ecclesiastical, and almost the highest civil, places in Europe, and had thus no want of opportunity to compare their earlier institutes with those of houses of another order or in another land. It was not so in the nunneries. Although women trained in them were often far more highly educated than the noblest ladies of secular life, yet there was little in the way of authorship to dispel the cloud which their secluded habits cast around them. At long intervals across the page of history we encounter the names of Baldovina of Poitiers, Heloisa of Argenteuil, Hrotswitha of Gandersheim, Hildegard of S. Rupert's Mount, Juliana Berners of S. Alban's, and, last and greatest, Teresa of Avila. Few save these can be found to mark the amount of intellectual life which was to be found in their communities, and none of them, save S. Teresa, whose date falls beyond the limits of the present inquiry, has left any remains which throw much light on the subject of monasticism. Hence may be conjectured how great its intricacy is, since even on those questions of discipline which would seem to be the most rudimentary and invariable, the most eminent canonists are at issue. The reader who is willing to follow the steps of the inquiry now to be laid before him, must therefore look for nothing beyond

were fragmentary excerpts, from which some general notion of the main facts may be gathered, and which will perhaps aid him in pursuing the matter further himself.

About A.D. 440, just as the disintegration of the West had commenced, died the last great ascetic writer whose works display clearly the combined influence of the East and the West, of Egypt and of Gaul. John Cassian, by the publication of his *Conferences* and *Institutes*, familiarized his countless readers with the ethics which might be learned in the deserts of Scete or in the courts of the Studium. Had the times been more favourable, the fame of establishing monachism on a firmer basis in the West might have rested with him; but the rapid fall of the great edifice of Imperial dominion, and the impetuous inroad of heathen barbarians, postponed for a century the work which Cassian had begun. In A.D. 543, two men rested from their labours in the same cause, having been permitted to see their aims carried out even beyond their warmest hopes. These two were S. Cæsarius of Arles, and S. Benedict of Nursia. The fame of the former rests now rather on his rank as a theologian, since the wide acceptance of the Rule devised by his great contemporary has thrown his once celebrated and popular code into obscurity. Some extracts from it will afford a good deal of insight into convent-life at the close of the fifth century. Novices were to pass a year in probation, wearing their secular dress, and were to be placed under the control of one of the elder Sisters. The Sisters were to possess no private property. They were not to receive children as boarders, unless they were designed for the monastic life. They were not to select their own tasks, but to execute such as were assigned to them. They were not permitted separate chambers, cupboards, or boxes. Punctuality at prayers and work-time was enjoined. Every Sister, except the Mother and the Provostess, had to discharge in turn the menial offices of the house. Silence was observed at meals. Two hours daily were given to reading; the remainder of the working day to the common execution of their tasks. A book was read aloud during the first hour of work, and secret meditation and prayer were recommended for the remaining time. They were forbidden to entertain any strangers, unless sisters of another house. Their dress was to be uniform in colour, not glittering nor yet black, but of white material. The precious metals were only to be used for ecclesiastical purposes, pictures were to be banished from their walls, and their work was not to consist of embroidery. Even the altar-cloths and other ornaments were not to be entirely of silk, but (as we learn from the co-ordinate rule for monks) if such were given to the house, the Superior was to sell them, and apply the price as occasion might require.

This Rule was amplified in several particulars by S. Aurelian, the successor of S. Cæsarius in the see of Arles. Stringent regu-

lations as to fasting and prayer were also embodied in these codes, but the details are not at present material.

A sterner rule, drawn from the iron discipline of Banchor, where S. Colgan was abbat, was introduced into France (and later into Italy) from Ireland, by S. Columbanus and S. Furseus, and into Germany by S. Kilian. Luxeuil and Beziers have disappeared, but some traces of the Celtic code long survived in Fulda and Bobio. S. Donatus of Besançon compiled a Rule compounded of all these, and enriched from that of S. Benedict; but its very eclecticism seems to have prevented it from spreading widely.

The year A.D. 530 almost exactly gives the date of the general acknowledgment of the three Vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience as essentials of the monastic life. They had existed virtually, and even expressly, for centuries before; but the Rule of S. Benedict in the West and the Code of Justinian I. in the East just at this time gave additional prominence and sanction to them. But the great stride made was in the Benedictine vow of "*stabilitas loci*," which put an end to the incessant migrations from one convent to another, and the perpetual fluctuations of rule and discipline which had proved the most serious drawback to the organization of anything like a homogeneous monastic system.

Passing over the specifications of the Benedictine Rule, which, as a treatise on the religious life, more than a code of statutes, is too long for citation, we come to consider the synodical enactments concerning nunneries, and their ecclesiastical position at this epoch. The old distinctions are still clearly traceable. The Deaconess is yet in existence, though rapidly dying out; while the Veiled Virgins and the Ecclesiastical ones are found subsisting side by side with equal duties, but unequal privileges, within the walls of the same house. The lay autonomy of the convents, though threatened by incessant encroachments on the part of the episcopate, is but little impaired, and the Acts of local synods aid the decrees and cartularies of Frank, Burgundian, and Gothic kings, in building up civil sanctions round the monastic life, which closely resemble those devised nearly at the same time in the East by the legists of Justinian's court.

The first synodical decree of importance after the death of S. Benedict is the nineteenth canon of the fifth Council of Orleans, A.D. 549. It directs that all novices should pass a year in their secular dress, before taking the conventual garb and vows, and in the case of those houses in which strict claustral seclusion was not observed, this term of probation was to be extended to three years. The Council further excommunicates such of the fully professed as should afterwards marry, and includes in this sentence the widows and virgins, who, remaining in their own families, and adopting the ecclesiastical dress and rule, should afterwards abandon them.

The fifth Council of Arles, A.D. 554, marks the time of the first positive claim put forward by the Bishops to exercise control over convents, other than the general supervision over all laics in their dioceses. Its second canon places monasteries of men under the direction of the Bishop, and the fifth is as follows; "The Bishops shall exercise supervision over the convents of maidens founded in their city, and it shall not be lawful for the abbess of such a monastery to do anything in contravention of the Rule."¹ The first Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, had indeed enacted in its nineteenth canon, that abbots should out of humility, be obedient to the Bishops, but it limited this obedience to their presence at yearly visitations, and submission to rebuke in case of any violation of their rules, and contrasted it very forcibly with the much greater deference due from the monks to their abbat.² The third Council of Paris, A.D. 557, repeats the anathemas of the Council of Orleans already quoted. The second Council of Tours, A.D. 567, has a very long and stringent canon (xx.) of excommunication against those who forsake the religious life. It is remarkable for the number of authorities which it quotes in support of its own provisions. These are the Epistles of S. Paul, a letter of Pope Innocent I., to Victricius, Bishop of Rouen, the Theodosian Code, the Council of Milevi, the second Council of Arles, the first Council of Orleans, the Council of Epaon, and the first Council of Auvergne. Next follows the first Council of Macon, A.D. 581, which contains three canons (ii., xii., xix.,) touching nunneries. The first of these regulates the admission of visitors within certain narrow limits, the second repeats the sentence of excommunication against the lapsed, which nine earlier councils had pronounced, and which many subsequent ones repeat. The third is very curious; it declares that a certain nun, named Agnes, had absconded from her convent, and had been sent back to it. She then attempted to bribe some influential persons with gifts of lands which she still possessed, that she might obtain licence to reside wherever she pleased. The Council directs that she and those with whom she was tampering should be excommunicated till satisfaction had been given, and that a similar sentence should pass against the like act for the future.

The time of the second Council of Tours is noticeable as the date of the earliest of those royal foundations of which so many are on record. It was established at Poitiers by S. Radegund, wife of Clothaire I., King of Neustria and Austrasia. There are so many particulars which make its history important, that it will be well to digress a little in order to state a few of them. We find

¹ "Ut episcopi de puellarum monasteriis quæ in sua civitate constituta sunt curam gerant, nec abbatiassæ ejus monasterii aliquid liceat contra regulam facere."

² "Abbates pro humilitate religionis in episcoporum potestate consistent, et si quid extra regulam fecerint ab episcopis corrigantur; qui semel in anno in loco ubi episcopus elegerit acceptâ vocatione conveniant. Monachi autem abbatibus omni se obedientiæ devotione subjiciant."

that the Benedictine Rule had not yet absorbed all others into itself, as it did somewhat later, for the house at Poitiers was put under that of S. Cæsarius. We notice, too, that while the office of Deaconess had been abolished for half-a-century in some parts of France, it yet survived in others, for S. Medard ordained S. Radegund to this rank when she commenced her new foundation. The right of patronage seems to have rested with founders, for Agnes, the second abbess of the new convent, was nominated by S. Radegund, who herself resigned her office and became a simple nun. The exact limits of the episcopal authority over convents at this time are very clearly defined by a dispute which arose between S. Radegund and Marovæus, Bishop of Poitiers. The Emperor Justin had sent the queen a relic of the true Cross, and she desired to have it received with great solemnity, and applied to the Bishop to officiate on the occasion. He gave a discourteous refusal, and S. Radegund appealed to King Sigebert to procure her the services of another Bishop. He appointed Euphronius, Bishop of Tours, to discharge the function, which he accordingly did. The ceremony has left permanent traces behind in the great processional hymn, "*Vexilla Regis prodeunt*," which was composed and written for it by Venantius Fortunatus. Marovæus, incensed at S. Radegund's conduct, withdrew his sanction from her House, and also (like a certain Bishop of very much more recent times) uncivilly refused an interview to the Superior, when she desired to discuss the matter with him. S. Radegund appealed to the King, who, by a special edict, deprived the Bishop of any control over the convent, and moreover declared that his successor in the see should have to apply formally for a licence to the crown before assuming any jurisdiction over it, and that he should, before obtaining such licence, undertake to respect the liberties of the house. One more fact we learn, of considerable importance in this inquiry, that the abbess was the only member of the convent who received the special veil of episcopal consecration. We shall see later that this was no exceptional case. The writings of S. Gregory the Great furnish our chief information on the state of convents at the close of the sixth century. We shall cite the most valuable details. In a letter to Maximian, Bishop of Syracuse. (Ep. iii. 11) he strictly forbids that very young women should be appointed abbesses, and further enjoins that veiling should be delayed till the sixtieth year. The word "*juvenculas*" plainly marks that women of maturer age, but still far under sixty, might be made abbesses, and yet without the special honour of the veil. Again, writing to Venantius, Bishop of Luna, (viii. 43) who had asked him to find a suitable person to be abbess of a convent in that city, he enjoins him to give the community advice when necessary, to be ready to show them every kindness, and to help them in all their secular business, so that they might never be in distress or perplexity, but might give them-

selves without distraction to prayer and praise. When we add to these particulars the right of inquiring into alleged abuses, and especially such as involved the breach of the Rule, we shall have exhausted the powers which the Church allowed Bishops over convents for the first eight hundred years.

The seventh century is not a very noteworthy period in the history of convents. There are no synodical decrees of importance concerning them save one, which is that of the Synod convened by S. Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, in A.D. 670. Its third canon provides that no bishop is to disturb the monasteries in any respect. Nor do we read of any great foundations at this time, if we except those of S. Agatha and of S. Mary at Pavia, established severally by Bertharid and Cunibert, kings of the Lombards (who reigned between the years A.D. 671 and 700,) one at Benevento, by its Duke Grimoald, and one at Brescia in 756, by king Desiderius. A name for the virgins which, if not altogether new, had at least fallen into disuse, appears in the eighth century, "Servant of God," (*Ancilla DEI*), is the phrase used by the Council of Rome, A.D. 721. A charter given by one Orso, an ecclesiastic, to a convent which he founded at Lucca in the following year, shows the right of patronage extended beyond one turn. He appoints his daughter abbess, and nominates her cousin as next in succession, leaving the election afterwards open. He also inserts a clause forbidding any priest to intrude there, even for the discharge of ecclesiastical functions, unless at the direct invitation of the Sisters, which is tantamount to claiming for them freedom of choice in the selection of a Director.¹

That the lay independence of convents was still asserted appears from another remarkable deed of gift, founding the nunnery and guest-house of S. Peter at Pistoja. It was executed in A.D. 748, by one Ratfrid, who inserts a special clause that the new foundations should not be subject to any church, cathedral or other. In speaking (as we shall have occasion to do more than once) of this freedom from episcopal control, it must be remembered that it is a question of kind as well as of degree. At no time was it held in the Early Church that any Christians in a diocese could by an act of their own put themselves out of their Bishop's jurisdiction. But his authority over ecclesiastics was obviously quite unlike that which he exercised over laymen, who were rather bound to general deference than to any specified acts of obedience. At the first, all monastic foundations were essentially lay, and it was regarded as a very undesirable innovation and as savouring of pride when some few monks sought for holy orders. The Bishops, on the other hand, sought to compel the higher officials to receive ordination in order to obtain canonical rights over them, and were successful in the course of the struggle, although not completely so in the West till the

¹ Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* (ed. 1778,) xiii. 425.

eleventh century. Their authority in the case of their clergy and of the convents in their dioceses may be likened to that of a general commanding a friendly district in time of war as exerted severally over his soldiers and over civilians. As it was impossible to make the inmates of nunneries other than lay, especially after the female diaconate had fallen into disuse, it was long before they were as completely subjected to the Bishops as the monks had been, and the Papal exemptions, so bitterly complained of at a later time, did little but restore to them rights which had been long disregarded. The last occasion on which an Œcumenical Synod dealt with the monastic question was at the Second Council of Nice in 787. The canon which it passed had for its object the suppression of the double monasteries which so long existed in the East and West. The institution was at first designed for mutual help, that the monks might till the ground for the nuns, and the nuns spin and weave clothing in return. Although the intercourse between the two was fenced round with stringent restrictions, yet the objections against the system were held to outweigh its advantages, and Nice completed for the East what Justinian had attempted two centuries earlier. But the opposition which some of the later Nicene decrees met in the West extended to this particular, and not only did the custom long survive, but it obtained a new lease of existence when S. Gilbert of Sempringham founded the Order named after him about the year 1148.

The intricate dispute about the right of veiling which arose in the eighth century seems to have partly originated in a new claim put forward by the Bishops. Edicts of Karl the Great in 789 and 799 forbid Chorepiscopi and abbesses to bestow the veil; and in the Sixth Council of Paris in 829, the prohibition was repeated, and priests included in it. The language of these several enactments is very strong and requires citation. Thus the edict of Aix-la-Chapelle in 789 runs as follows: "It has come to our ears that certain abbesses, contrary to the custom of God's holy Church, veil virgins with priestly benediction, which thing you, holy fathers, are to understand is to be entirely forbidden them in your dioceses." And so the Parisian Synod: "Certain abbesses and other nuns are accustomed to veil not only widows but also virgins. How unlawful this is for women to do and how foreign it is to the Christian religion, any sensible person can readily observe." Again, the same Synod speaks: "We have obtained information from certain persons, that some priests, forgetful of their position, and even resisting canonical authority, have been bold enough to consecrate virgins." It proceeds to threaten them with excommunication in case of persisting. We are met on the other hand by the Capitulary of S. Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury, stating that a priest is competent to give the benediction to an abbess, and by the decree of the Council of Friuli, held about A.D. 795, under Paulinus, Pa-

triarch of Aquileia, which acknowledged the right of the priests to admit women to the religious life without reference to the Bishop. Besides, the very Council of Paris which objects to the conduct of the abbesses and priests declares that nuns veiled by them were to be found in almost every monastery. (In omnibus pæne monasteriis puellaribus hujusmodi velatas invenies.) The Council ascribes this fact to the negligence of the Bishops, a reason that will hardly satisfy those who have noticed how very strongly episcopal claims were usually put forward and enforced at that time. Nor is it likely that so grave an innovation could on the one hand have spread so widely, nor on the other have found archiepiscopal and synodical countenance. The Bishops, again, can scarcely be charged with setting up an entirely new claim. The truth would seem to be that there were two perfectly distinct veils, conferred with two different forms of benediction; one of which, as esteemed the more honourable, was reserved for Bishops to bestow, while the other was the ordinary form of reception into a convent, left to the abbess and the director.

The veil given by Bishops was a recognition of higher saintliness, but not of higher rank, and an abbess might be without it while the lowest in station of her community might possess it, just as a private soldier may happen to wear the Victoria Cross which a mere court lackey, though raised to the rank of general and decorated with the Bath, cannot venture to assume. In practice, no doubt, the wearer of the special veil would most frequently occupy the more responsible positions, but the ornament was purely honorary and gave no additional permanence to the original vow, any more than the Victoria Cross renews the original enlistment of the soldier.

We shall now proceed to show that this view is no mere hypothesis, but an established fact. From the terms of the treatise of Tertullian on the Veiling of Virgins, it is clear that a veil was deemed an essential part of the garb of a Christian maiden in his day. This work is repeatedly cited with approval by the Western writers whom we meet as we descend to later times, which shows that the feeling on this head was unaltered. The devout women who retained their ordinary secular garb most probably continued to wear their ordinary veils too. But the Veiled Virgins wore one of a peculiar make and colour, the purple *flammeum virginale*, to which we have referred in a former paper. It would naturally follow that the Ecclesiastical Virgins, and Professed, who, though still living in the world, had adopted the dark dress, would assume a special veil or cap (the *mitra*, mentioned by Optatus of Milevi,) in keeping with the rest of their attire. Even if they had not had the example of the Virgins of the highest rank before them, we might trust to their feminine instincts in such matters. We learn from S. Jerome that the act of putting on this special dress was attended with a religious function, however inferior in pomp to the solemn bestowal of the veil. It is hardly to be supposed that the

act became less solemn when its customary place became the chapel of a convent instead of an apartment in a private house. As yet formal Sacerdotal and Pontifical were not, and it is highly probable that the office of reception was modelled on the familiar office of the Veil, and may have been too accurate a copy not to have given rise to mutual misunderstandings. It is noticeable that the disputes begin exactly at the time when the public consecration of Virgins in the cathedrals began to be disused, and that in proportion as it became rarer, the claims of the Bishops were advanced further and further to obtain for themselves the sole privilege of receiving all monastic vows.

For the sake of briefness, we shall pass over the earlier stages of the dispute and come at once to the seventh century. The authority we shall quote is S. Isidore of Seville. In the second book of his treatise on Ecclesiastical Offices he explains the reason why the veil is conferred. His account is that it is meant as some amends for the privation of all priestly functions under which women lie, and that those who have solemnly dedicated themselves may bear some mark of especial honour which may be noticed as they enter church. It is clear that he cannot mean nuns, for the claustral rule, though not always enforced with the stringency of later times, certainly did not permit the inhabitants of convents to resort in this way to places of worship beyond their own precincts. The churches attached to such early foundations as even those of S. Pachomius and S. Paula seem to have been designed only for monastic purposes, and the system of complete claustral seclusion was fully developed in several places before the close of the sixth century, especially under the rule of S. Cæsarius. The reference therefore, must be to the last remains of the uncloistered Virgins who held the highest laic rank in the primitive Church. The Provincial Synod of Liptines, in the diocese of Cambrai, held in A.D. 743, divides nuns into two classes, "Servants of God," and "Veiled Nuns," (*Ancillæ DEI. Nonnæ velatæ.*) Here we recognise the distinctions of four hundred years earlier, and receive a caution against importing the misleading terminology of a later age into the history of that with which we are at present concerned. We are so accustomed to use the phrase "taking the veil," to denote entry even into the novitiate that we forget that the expression dates only from the decadence of monasticism, and implies something widely different from its earlier meaning. For it is plain that no especial monastic dress was assumed by novices as late as the seventh, perhaps the tenth century. That their secular garb and veil would be much simpler and less costly than that of other women is reasonable to suppose, but no person in those days would have spoken of them as "veiled," in the technical sense. The general phrase is, however, used by the Council of Verneuil-sur-Oise in 753, which speaks of more than one kind of veiling.

“Whatever way a woman has received the veil, let her abide in that, unless she has been veiled against her will or under protest.” The several ways hinted at are, no doubt, taking the veil herself, being given it by her parents, or solemnly decked with it by a priest or bishop.

Another obvious difficulty is the large number of widows who were found in the convents. Their vows, life, and duties were in no particular unlike those of the other inmates, but no conventional rank nor personal holiness could obtain the special veil for them. In the first ages of the Church we find priests always permitted to receive the vows and give their veil to the widows, and from the fifth century down Bishops are absolutely prohibited from doing so. A widow, even in the later Pontificals, so far from being veiled by the Bishop, is directed to veil herself, if no priest be present to do it for her. This rule was the natural corollary from the tenet of the lower spiritual position of a widow as compared with a virgin, and the impossibility of attaching the same sacramental idea to a second union, whether earthly or heavenly, as to a first one. Hence the mere toleration of second marriages in the Early Church, as not representing the mystical and indissoluble union between CHRIST and His Bride, and hence, too, the widely different language of the ancient offices of matrimony when designed for a first and a second bridal. The difference may almost be compared to that existing between the ordinary exhortation to communion in the Book of Common Prayer and that employed when the negligence of the people is to be rebuked. With what horror the saints of ancient Christendom would have looked on an ecclesiastic who had ventured on a third marriage, and how little respect they would have paid to any plea that he had done so from a deep conviction of the higher condition of matrimony and a consequent desire to raise as many as possible into it, need hardly be said.

An argument has sometimes been urged against the belief of this lower position of widows in the Early Church from the language of Tertullian, in which he protests strongly against a Virgin being admitted on the canon of Widows. But, in fact, he is exclaiming against a pecuniary job, not against a spiritual intrusion. The widows received a certain sum from the ecclesiastical funds, and any assignment of these funds to persons of another class was clearly indefensible. But the fact in no degree marks their higher position, any more than the vindication of the claims of the free students in some of our older scholastic foundations denotes that their position is higher than that of the well-born intruders in whose favour their vested interests have been disregarded. With the widows then, found in convents in such numbers as history assures us, it is obvious that the Bishop could not, without a breach of the existing discipline, have been the recipient of all vows. Not

even of most vows, for the age of twenty-five was still the lowest for receiving the veil, while profession was made by secular virgins at eighteen, and by those reared from childhood in convents much earlier. But to establish this fact fully, and not as mere matter of inference, two proofs are yet wanting. The first is evidence that there really are two different veils (distinct from the two used later by novices and fully professed nuns) plainly mentioned anywhere. The second, that the special episcopal consecration of Virgins continued to exist, separately from monastic reception, in testimony of the original nature of the institution, and in witness against the usurped power of Bishops over convents.

The first proof is afforded by the important letter of Peter Abelard to Heloisa, containing the rule for the nuns of the Paraclete. "We will that there be two kinds of veils, the one for the virgins actually consecrated by the Bishop, the other for those not so. Those which belong to the first-named virgins are to have a cross marked on them. . . . As by their consecration they are marked off as belonging to a different rank from the others, so too let them be distinguished by this mark of attire. . . . The virgin will bear this token of virginal purity defined in white thread on the crown of her head, and is by no means to attempt to wear it till she has been consecrated by the Bishop. No other veils are to be distinguished in this way."

The second testimony is as easy to produce. It will be unnecessary to construct a catena of examples, for a few from various centuries will suffice. Thus, Sophia, sister of the Emperor Otho III. (crowned in 996), was solemnly consecrated by Osdag, Bishop of Hildesheim. This consecration is noteworthy because of a question of privilege which arose out of it. The princess wished for an Archbishop to perform the ceremony (most probably the Metropolitan, the Primate of Mentz), but Osdag established his claim as diocesan, and obliged the princess to promise submission to the see of Hildesheim. The same prelate consecrated several other virgins one Epiphany, in presence of the Emperor. The next testimony is more remarkable, as showing that the rule was due to sentiment, not to the essence of the system. It is that of Ivo of S. Chartres (+ 1115). "The consecration of Virgins (which by apostolic authority is reserved for Bishops as their privilege) if at any time it be usurped by priests, is not to be repeated by the Bishops, because of the Sacrament of CHRIST and the Church contained in it." (Ep. xxv.) The Council of Oxford in 1222 enacts, "Only a consecrated nun may wear a ring, and she must be content with one." A charter executed by the Bishop of Troyes in 1324, allows the nuns of the Convent of S. Mary in that city to apply for consecration to any bishop they pleased. Not, be it observed, for their original reception and vows, but for the honorary veil. The usage reappears, included amongst episcopal privileges, in the Acts of the

Council of Augsburg, held under Cardinal Otho in 1548, and still later in the same century we find an attempt to revive it (proving thus that it was always distinct from the admission of nuns) made by the great S. Charles Borromeo in the Fourth Synod of Milan, A.D. 1576. The words of the decree are,—“Wherever the old and godly custom of solemnly veiling nuns has become obsolete in these times, let a return be made to former usage in accordance with the ancient institution and rite, provided it take place within the convent.” And Mabillon, in his *Italian Museum*, mentions that he saw the old ceremony performed at Venice in May, 1685. “On Sunday, at S. Zachary’s Church, there was a consecration of six noble Benedictine nuns by the Patriarch. This is usually done some years after their profession with great pomp and circumstance.” (*Mus. Ital. Vol. I. p. 35.*) Finally, the ancient custom is yet preserved in the one Order which has never departed from its statutes, and which proudly names itself “The Unreformed.” The Carthusian Rule admits full profession after a year’s novitiate, but none may wear the black veil, or receive the solemn benediction till the age of twenty-five, although in former times she might thus have waited for it for twelve long years.

After this long, but necessary, digression, we return to the regular course of our investigation. The ninth century was one marked by important events in conventual history. To it belongs the *Concordia Regularum* of S. Benedict (of Aniane in Languedoc), which aimed at bringing together into a code the rules of all the founders of monasteries of the East and West. Also we trace the consolidation of one of the ancient sodalities of the fourth century into a form suited to the usages of the ninth.

We have had occasion to mention more than once the Ecclesiastical Virgins, who occupied the next rank to the Veiled in the Early Church, and have noted how they began to retire into convents at the close of the fourth century. But there was always a considerable number which did not act in this way, and moreover there are evident marks of the existence of a yet larger and less defined body of women more or less closely associated with them, but leading a less strict life, and complying more with secular usages, although still marked off in some degree from the general mass of the laity. Very many of these two classes, as time went on, were desirous of becoming members of some corporate body, without accepting all the details of the Benedictine Rule, which in the eighth century had absorbed every other monastic code in the West except in a few houses of Celtic foundation. The plan found favour, and may be said to have fairly made good its ground towards the close of the reign of Karl the Great. Those who adopted this middle course between secular and monastic life, took as the basis of their institution the famous Epistle (cix.) of S. Augustine, and styled themselves Canonesses from that canon of life, just as

their austerer sisters named themselves Regulars from the Rule of their great founder. They had, in a certain sense, existed long before this time, but so completely do they belong in their developed state to the ninth century, that most historians have ascribed their first institution to the Emperor Ludwig the Pious, son and successor of Karl the Great.

The history of female monasticism in the Western Church divides itself henceforth into two great trunks, from which fresh branches constantly shot out.

If the claim of the Franciscans in the thirteenth century to have planted an entirely fresh stem be allowed, we shall have to admit a third; but nearly all others, except the Carmelites, who derive from S. Basil the Great, and the quickly suppressed Jesuitesses, and the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, belong to one or other of the two great orders of Augustinians and Benedictines. The most famous names on the former genealogical tree are the Hospitallers, the Beguines, the Dominicans, the Ursulines, the Annunciades, and the Visitandines. On the Nursian stem, the Cluniacs, the Cistercians, the Bernardines, and the Sisters of Fontevraud. The unchanging Carthusians, whose fitting motto is, "*Stat crux dum volvitur orbis*," are the joint offspring of the two rules in union, and the Brigettine nuns blend the observances of S. Basil and S. Augustine. We do not purpose to enter into any details touching these various orders, and will continue to trace the course of the main events which affect them all alike.

Several Synods met in the year 813, at all of which canons were passed dealing with monastic houses. The places of meeting were Mentz, Arles, Rheims, Tours, and Chalons-sur-Saône. Some of these canons increase the stringency of the claustral rule, and forbid even abbesses to leave their convents without permission from the Bishop. Others direct that due subsistence be provided for the nuns by those appointed for that purpose, who, from the word used (*pralati*), would seem to have been, as in the ancient times, the Bishops. Two of that held at Tours deal with the age of veiling, restricting it as a general rule to twenty-five in the case of virgins, and directing that young widows be not veiled at all without deliberation. Thirteen canons of the Council of Chalons give laws "to those nuns who call themselves Canonesses, since all those who live under the guidance of monastic rules have all the order of their life written in the Rule which they profess." These are mainly injunctions to observe the claustral laws, to say the hours, live in common, &c. One clause marks the strides made by episcopal power since the synods of the sixth century. The abbess is directed to refer to the Bishop all points not settled by the canons now laid down, and to yield him canonical obedience. The great Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 816, is yet more important, for it was mainly engaged with fixing the rule for Canons and Canonesses,

and the first and second books of its Acts contain the new institutes for the Augustinian Regulars, who therefore date, in a sense, from this time.

The main differences between these Canonesses and the Benedictine nuns were that the former were allowed the usufruct of any private property they possessed, instead of being bound by a vow of poverty (though some colleges took even this), and that they were permitted to have servants to wait on them. Almost at the same time when these regular canonesses received their incorporation, another body entitled Secular Canonesses sprang up in Germany. The identity of name and date has occasioned a good deal of confusion between them and the stricter order. Several of their colleges long existed under the name of Noble Abbeys in Hainault, Brabant, and various parts of Germany. Amongst other interesting details of monastic customs in the *Historia Occidentalis* of Cardinal James of Vitry, the following censure on these latter, as they appeared in the thirteenth century, is worthy of citation: "In imitation and after the pattern of the aforesaid Canons, in parts of Hainault and Brabant, and in some provinces of the Teutons and Alemanni, there are certain women whom they call Secular Canonesses or Demoiselles (*domicellas*). For they do not choose to be called Nuns. . . . They are such accepters of persons that they will receive at their colleges only the daughters of knights and nobles. . . . They dress themselves in purple, and fine linen, and vair furs, and other adornments; they wear particoloured embroidery, have their hair plaited . . . use the finest and softest lamb's wool. If one of them, for humility's sake, were to put on a cloak, they would call her a canting, beggarly sneak (*miseram et abjectam et hypocritam*), and would not put up with her, as thinking her a disgrace to their nobility." He proceeds to dwell on their trains of attendants, their dinner-parties, and their visits, and declares that some of them used to leave the college and get married; but that he had known a great number who remained simple and uncorrupted in the midst of all this luxury.

We have had occasion already to refer to the council held at Paris in 829, and have mentioned its enactments against priests and abbesses bestowing the special veil. It contains some other important provisions, such as forbidding to raise widows to abbatial rank without due probation, directing priests to give notice to the Bishop before even veiling them, and ordaining that they should not take the veil at all till the first month of their widowhood had expired. Nearly a century before, Luitprand, King of Lombardy, had extended this restriction to a year, but his law had been abrogated by Karl the Great. An abuse which had crept in of needy women assuming the religious dress of their own accord, in hopes of being employed about churches, was put down, and the clergy were instructed not to encourage them. One of the last

relics of the office of the Deaconess (incorrectly deemed an innovation) was swept away by the forty-fifth canon, which forbade women to approach the altar, handle the sacred vessels, hold the priest's vestments for him, or administer the pre-consecrated Sacrament. Every one of these privileges had been allowed the Deaconess in the Eastern convents from the fourth century downwards; and it is curious to find them locally surviving the general decay of the office in the West.

The Council of Worms in 868 is remarkable as the last Western synod which mentions the Deaconess at all. Benedict VIII. (1019—1024) and Leo IX. (1048—1050) mention the name incidentally in enumerating the powers of ordination vested in Bishops; but the real Deaconess of the Early Church had practically disappeared in the seventh century. Her only representatives were the abbesses (sometimes called *diaconissæ*¹) and the veiled nuns, who retained the privilege of reading the Gospel in the Nocturns. The canonist Fagnan declares that they did so "loco Diaconissatus." The synod of Tribur, on the Rhine, in 895, has little noteworthy. It renews the limitation of age necessary for the greater veil, and the prohibition against Bishops consecrating widows. That the sole right of supervision did not lie with the prelates at this time, appears from the fact that the Emperor Lothaire I. appointed inspectors of nunneries in Italy in 883. The tenth century, emphatically the Dark Age, contains little of interest; but early in the eleventh, a document of mark makes its appearance. It is the deed of foundation of a convent in Turin, by Maginfred and his wife Bertha, which expressly provides that the house should not be under the control of the Bishop of the diocese, either Turin or any other to which the inmates should migrate; and empowered the abbess, should her diocesan refuse on this ground, to invite any other Bishop to consecrate her. There is a very slight hint of submission to the Roman Chair, but when we recollect that as late as the time of Pope Honorius II. (1124—1130), the abbat of Monte Cassino, head of all the Benedictine houses, refused to swear allegiance even to the Pope himself,² it will appear that no great amount of compliance was intended. It is not surprising, accordingly, to find the nuns of this house ousted in favour of monks in 1444; for Eugenius IV., who had checkmated the Council of Basle, and made a good thing out of that of Florence, was not likely to allow his authority to be resisted in a provincial convent. Several examples of this suppression of nunneries exist. Sometimes the reasons were valid, such as scanty numbers, or slender and even insufficient means of support. From the Capitularies of 789 downwards there were efforts made to abate these evils, sometimes by special contributions of money, sometimes by distributing the inmates amongst wealthier

¹ Peter Abelard. Ep. 8. *passim*.

² Chron. Abb. Mont. Casin. iv. 95.

foundations, but often the suppression seems to have been a punishment awarded for the assertion of independence. No such suppressions of monks in favour of nuns are to be found, although we do meet with a few grants of deserted and ruined monasteries made to abbesses. But the abbats and priors were all priests, and subject to special canonical jurisdiction, and were therefore more easily governed in the interest of the Bishop. How far this independence of the convents was stretched at times we learn from the very curious relation existing in some places between them and the clergy who ministered to them in spiritual matters. Thus in a charter granted to S. Radegund's convent of the Holy Cross at Poitiers, by King Pippin, acting for his father the Emperor Ludwig, it is provided, "All care is to be taken that the number of clerics is not to be raised above thirty, and they are to be obedient, honourably and perfectly, and subject in all respects to the said congregation of the Holy Cross. . . . If any one objects he is free to leave."¹ Bede² tells us that the same rule existed in the great convent of Streonesheal (now Whitby), where S. Hilda was abbess. The last remains of the usage in England are found in the constitutions of the Brigettine nuns, whom King Henry V. established at Sion House, in 1414. A parallel to this singular discipline may be found in the case of the Bishops who were in all respects subject to the abbats of I, and who were retained only for purposes of ordination, and not for jurisdiction.

The eleventh century saw a new development of the monastic principle, owing to the motive force of the Crusades. The military Orders which sprang up were not without their influence on the life of women as well as of men. In connection with the Hospitallers, Teutonic Knights, and Knights of S. Lazarus, there were convents of women established, whose chief labours were in the lazarett-houses, infirmaries, and other establishments founded by these bodies. They were the germ of the greater part of the active orders of later times. It would, however, be a grave mistake to suppose that these were the first distinctly charitable foundations of monasticism. From the third century downwards we read of schools, hospitals, orphanages, and guest-houses, under the charge of both monks and nuns, not to speak of the special chambers for the sick and for strangers to be found in nearly every monastery. But the Crusades fix the date of the establishment of orders whose primary duty was charity, and whose rule was constructed on a distinctly active, not a contemplative, basis.

At this time the monastic system had reached its most complete development, and we will now turn aside for a time from historical events to give a few details of the inner discipline of the houses. The government was vested in the abbess and chapter, which body consisted of the chief officials of the convent and of the confirmed

¹ Mabillon. Vet. Anal. (ed. 1728) p. 151.

² Hist. Ecol. iv. 23.

sisters. In Peter Abelard's time, the office-bearers were seven in number, namely, the abess (whom he always calls deaconess), the cantrix, or mistress of the choir, the mistress of the robes, the infirmarer, the sacristan or treasurer, the cellarer, and the portress. Three officers, two of earlier and one of later date, do not appear in this list. They are the prioress or *Præposita* (whose duties the cantrix discharged in the Paraclete), the *Formaria* or mistress of the novices, and the mistress of the pensioners. This last dignity was of comparatively late introduction, as in the first seven centuries of monasticism secular boarders were not admitted. Besides these greater officers there were additional ones in a few great abbeys, as subprioress, bursar, keeper of the seal, &c. Lesser functionaries were appointed in rotation, as the *hebdomadaria*, refectioner, reader, &c. The power of the abbesses, though held in check by the chapters, and sometimes by the visitors, provincial or diocesan, was very great. Peter Abelard and Robert of Arbrisses, founder of Fontevraud, agree in preferring a widow for the post, on account of her temporal experience. The latter actually forbade nuns of his foundation to be candidates for election as abbess, and enjoined that some laic or widow of repute for piety and good sense, should be appointed to that office. Several canonists, amongst whom are Vivaldi and Miranda, oppose this view; but they appear to have done so under the belief that all abbesses ought to have the special veil, in which they were in error. The greater names of Suarez and Sanchez are ranked against them. Some abbesses were elected for life, and others for only three years. The latter rule was made the usual one by the later Popes of the sixteenth century. The election was conducted by ballot in full chapter, after licence had been obtained (if necessary by the terms of the charter) from founders' kin, or the Sovran. The presiding Bishop and his scrutineers had no votes, except in some Portuguese convents, and it was usual to receive only the suffrages of confirmed sisters, though no regular law appears to have prohibited novices and lay sisters from tendering their votes. That the episcopal benediction did not constitute the abbess, appears very plainly from Van Espen, Navarro, Gavanti, and others. To pass over other proofs, it is only necessary to remark, that this benediction was never given to triennial abbesses or prioresses, who, nevertheless, had full powers during their terms, and that there is no mention of such benediction in any ancient Rule.¹ In any case, it by no means followed that the diocesan was the person to bestow it, unless the charter of the house placed it expressly under him.² Besides other privileges once allowed the abbesses, two are especially noteworthy. The first was that of hearing the confessions of the nuns. This

¹ "Promotionem abbatis non facit Episcopalis Benedictio, sed Fratrum Communis electio." S. Ivo. Carnot. De Eccl. Off.

² So Layman, Van Espen, Lezana, Tamburini, &c.

was allowed by the rules of S. Basil and S. Donatus. Not, of course, with any idea of the power of the keys being entrusted to her, but in harmony with the older idea of confession, which was not for many centuries tied down practically to the limits of confession to a single priest. But in the time of the Greek canonist Balsamon this privilege was lost in the East, and it seems to have disappeared four centuries earlier in the Western Church.¹

The other privilege was that of giving the blessing to the Sisters, not however as part of a public religious function, but privately as their spiritual mother. So, too, as their mother, she had the power of annulling any special vows which they might have taken on themselves over and above the conventual obligations, although she was not allowed to grant mere dispensations or mitigations, (except of the vow of poverty,) as that was held to belong to spiritual jurisdiction, in which women have no share. So, too, she might receive the profession of a novice, but could not admit a postulant to the novitiate without superior sanction. She might in smaller matters deal with the temporalities, but all affairs of weight had to come before the chapter. The abbess might be deposed for infringing the charter or the rule. Thus, in a convent founded by Count Winigis at Siena in 867, it was provided that if the abbess allowed the number of sisters to remain below twenty, she was not merely to be deposed, but expelled, as guilty of malversation.

The prioress was her chief vicar, and discharged her functions during sickness, absence, or vacancy. The choir-mistress had charge of the singing-school, and music-books, and the direction of the office in choir. The infirmarer was expected to understand pharmacy and the rudiments of surgery, and had the charge of the hospital and the guest-house. The vestiaria saw to the clothes and bedding of the inmates, to the collection of wool and flax for spinning, and to the apportioning of tasks. The sacristan had charge of the oratory and the valuables of the convent. She was, however, not allowed to touch the chalice or paten, which the priest alone, or monks appointed by him, might handle. The cellarer had control over all the cellars, larder, and kitchen, and saw to the necessary provisions being laid in and distributed. The portress received all messages, and was the chief of those vicars who distributed the external doles.

The claustral rule was in the main very strictly enforced, although certain relaxations of it were allowed to all save recluses.

¹ The reason given for its abrogation by Pope Innocent III. must sound strange in neo-Roman ears. "Because, although the most blessed Virgin Mary was higher and more excellent than all the Apostles, yet it was not to her, but to them that the Lord committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven."—Innoc. III. ad Episcop. Valent. Burgen.

This was the case from very early times. S. Scholastica is thus said to have quitted her convent but once a year, to pay a visit of a few hours to her brother S. Benedict, and there are numbers of episcopal and synodical prohibitions, from the time of S. Gregory the Great downwards, placing restrictions on exit from the convents without good reason. Such were going to do homage to the Emperor or other feudal superior; proceeding on pilgrimage, of which Chaucer supplies a familiar example; attending to receive a donative, as was enjoined by Heribert, Archbishop of Milan, in 1084; or joining in some great public solemnity, as a litany or a procession. Thus a mediæval poet, describing the approach of the Emperor Henry V. to Rome, to be crowned, in 1111, mentions that in the procession which met him there were a hundred nuns:

“ Monachæ quoque centum
Lampadibus multis cum claro lumine sumtis.”

The form of admission was reduced to great uniformity by the Pontificals. Local variations are found, and special offices were allowed the Carthusians and Brigettines; but the customs in all other orders are nearly alike, especially in the strictness with which payment for admission was reprobated as simoniacal. There was but little ceremony observed at the reception of a novice, but the forms of the consecration of nuns and benediction of abbesses are very elaborate.

The veil, robe, and ring were common to all nuns. The first two dated from primitive times. The third is certainly later than the fifth century, for S. Germanus of Auxerre, when consecrating S. Genevieve, particularly directed her to wear no ring. On the other hand, it is not later than the middle of the seventh century; for S. Eloi, Bishop of Noyon, (+ 659,) used one in the consecration of the nun Godilberta. Cutting the hair is a very late innovation in the West, and was strictly forbidden, save as a penance for grave offences, by the Second Council of Verneuil, in 844. The growth of the custom would seem to have been due to an overstrained idea of self-abasement.

Although the degree of austerity varied in different orders, yet the general routine was much the same in all. There were the eight canonical hours to be said in choir, marking out, when strictly observed, every third hour of the day and night. There were the two, and sometimes three, stated times for meals. There were periods set apart for needlework, spinning, reading, meditation, and private prayer; and besides all these, there were the solemn chapters, in some places daily, nowhere seldomer than weekly, in which the affairs of the convent were debated, and all breaches of the Rule examined and censured. It was customary on each of these occasions to read the Rule through, and to ask whether any one had to confess a breach of it. Those who had to

do so advanced into the midst, and named their fault, when the abbeſs or the preſiding vicar appointed the penance. If the abbeſs herſelf were the culprit, ſhe named her own penance, or had it enjoined her by the confeſſor of the houſe.

Such is a brief ſummary of the poſition in which convents ſtood at the beginning of the twelfth century. The great number of new orders which then ſprang up produced an immense maſs of trivial variations, ſuch, for example, as thoſe of the Ciftercian Statutes, which may be found in the *Thesaurus Anecdotorum* of Martene and Durand. The ſemi-ſecular inſtitution of the Beguines (A.D. 1170,) with their partial vows and parochial organization, is the moſt remarkable innovation of this period, as it inaugurated a freſh form of the common life, and is the type from which all active orders ſince eſtabliſhed have more or leſs borrowed their ſystem. From this period there are not many enactments which affect monaſticism collectively, although there are countless ſtatutes and conſtitutions for particular communities.¹ The Council of Oxford, in 1222, provides for the maintenance of the common life and of general diſcipline, and alſo renews the direction to the Biſhop to ſee that the ſteward of the temporalities does his duty. Some minor abuſes are reprehended at Salzburg in 1281, at Wurzburg in 1287, at Ravenna in 1314 and 1317, and at Sens in 1527. But none of theſe Councils contains any very material ſtatements. With the date of the Lutheran movement in Germany coincide the Councils of Cologne in 1536 and of Treves and Augſburg in 1548. The moſt important canon of the former is one which allows nuns to chooſe (with conſent of their ſuperiors) a confeſſor other than the director of the houſe, if they can give any good reaſon for doing ſo. The later ones are mainly engaged with the difficulty of dealing with thoſe who were attracted by the new teaching, and no longer ſhewed obedience to their rule. The Counter-Reformation, inaugurated by the Council of Trent, ſpeedily ſet in, and its provisions, as well as the details of the diſcipline and hiſtory of the new orders and congregations which have been multiplying ever ſince, are eaſily acceſſible.

If the above paragraphs aid in familiarizing ſtudents with ſome fragments of the obſcure hiſtory of the eleven hundred years which preceded the Tridentine Synod, our aim will have been fully accompliſhed.

¹ But by far the moſt noteworthy circumſtance in this century is the commencement of the practice of diſpenſing vows, afterwards carried to ſuch an extent. The two firſt examples on record are linked with great hiſtorical events. They are the elevation of the monk Don Ramiro to the throne of Aragon in 1134, in order to avert a threatened civil war. He married, and when his daughter reached womanhood, and married in her turn, the King withdrew once more to his monaſtery. The other caſe was when Pope Celeſtine III. diſpenſed Conſtance, daughter of Roger, King of Sicily, from her vows, that ſhe might marry the Emperor Henry VI. The iſſue of this marriage was that dazzling and uſeleſs meteor, Frederick II., whom Matthew Paris truly ſtyles the "Wonder of the World."

THE POSITION OF THE PAPACY IN CHRISTENDOM.

The Church and the Churches ; or, the Papacy and the Temporal Power ; an Historical and Political Review. By Dr. DÖLLINGER. Translated, with the Author's permission, by WILLIAM BERNARD MACCABE. London : Hurst and Blackett. 1862.

THIRD NOTICE.

WHATSOEVER changes have taken place in the world around, Rome still remains "The Eternal City." She has passed through many vicissitudes, and is now perhaps on the point of a great crisis ; but the strongest storm, which hitherto has beat upon her, has been insufficient for her overthrow. To Rome we look in spite of all our English prejudices, and recognise in her the mother city of art, civilization, and even Christianity itself. England was once a Roman province, and it was from the city on the seven hills that the light of civilization first burst upon the barbarian darkness with which Britain was enshrouded. They were Roman Monks from whose lips our Saxon forefathers first heard the blessed tidings of the Gospel, as they gathered round the throne of Queen Bertha in the Isle of Thanet. Thenceforward Rome has been so much mixed up both in our controversies and sympathies, that to visit Rome is an object of desire to every Englishman. With the scenes of ancient Rome we are perhaps even more familiar than with those of our own land. It is easier to picture to ourselves the Senators of old sitting on their curule chairs, than the Saxon Thanes and Bishops assembled at a Wittenagemot. The annals of old Rome are associated with our earliest reminiscences of schoolboy learning, whilst to explore the treasures of the Vatican Library is the *ultima Thule* of the scholar's ambition.

It is to this Rome, once the mother of jurisprudence, and now the worst governed of every European state, that our attention is directed by Dr. Dollinger. We promised our readers an article on the Position of the Papacy in Christendom, but in the fulfilment of our undertaking, we must first clear the way by ascertaining the position which the Papacy occupies in relation to the States over which it has received the temporal government. A volume might be devoted to a subject, so interesting to politicians of the present day. The origin and progress of the Pope's temporal power might be traced out, but this would befit the pages rather of a political than a religious Review, yet, as the Pope now holds his temporal power to be inalienable, it is impossible to dis sever the two questions, and therefore we must consider the suitability of the Papal Court to govern the States of the Church, before we come to the

question of its adaptability to be the centre of Christian Unity. Indeed we believe that the one must be cleared away before it can enter on the true position of the other. Whatever advantages may have been derived from the donation of the Lombard Kings, and out of evil God, in His providence, always brings some good, we believe that on the whole, the possession of temporal authority has proved the greatest impediment to the spiritual influence of the Bishop of Rome. In this opinion many eminent Romanists agree with us. Charles Butler expressed himself very strongly on the point. Even Bellarmine himself has said that "it would be better in itself if the Popes concerned themselves only with spiritual affairs, the Kings with temporal; but on account of the wickedness of the times, Divine Providence has seen fit to bestow temporal principalities on the Pope and other Bishops. It has been with the Church as with the Jews, amongst whom the Kingly dignity and the Pontifical were first united in the time of the Maccabees. In the earlier ages the Church did not need princely authority for the support of her majesty—now it seems to be a necessity." Fenelon also declares most emphatically that "the spiritual power must be kept carefully separate from the civil power, because their union is pernicious."

The temporal power of the Pope seems to have arisen first as a matter of necessity. When the Ostrogoths had been overthrown by the arms of the Byzantines, the Pope became the subject of the Eastern Emperors. At the close of the sixth century the Popes were the largest landed proprietors in the Peninsula, and the produce of their estates enabled them to supply the population of Rome with food, and to purchase peace from the Lombards. Gregory the Great exercised upon his numerous estates a certain jurisdiction, and superintended the Imperial Government officers in the discharge of their duties; and then, as the Eastern power in Italy diminished, and the Exarchate ceased to be able to maintain its position, the dominion and defence of Rome fell naturally to the Pope, as the only potentate who remained to protect the city. When the Iconoclast schism arose the Papal estates in Lower Italy and Sicily were seized by the Byzantine Emperor. But soon a recompense for this loss was made when Luitprand the Longobard King presented to the See of S. Peter a portion of Southern Tuscany, and the Frankish King made to the Pope a donation of the districts which he had conquered, Emilia, Flaminia, and the Pentapolis. In consideration for this act of generosity the Roman Patriciate was granted to the Frankish King, although the Byzantine authority was still in theory acknowledged. Among so many masters the Romans must have found it hard to understand to whom they owed obedience, and the independent authority of the Pope arose from this difficulty.

When Charlemagne assumed the imperial dignity, the shadow

of the Byzantine authority passed away from Italy, and now the Romans and the Pope took an oath of fealty to the new Emperor; but the limits between the Papal and Imperial authority were never distinctly drawn. The dismemberment and consequent enfeeblement of the Carolingian Empire, prevented the Patriciate of the Emperor from being any real protection to the Papacy. Not only did Italian princes seize the Papal cities, but soon the Roman nobles took upon themselves the right of electing the occupant of the Papal chair, and often elected men who became willing tools in their hands to work their own purposes. Never was the Papacy more degraded. One Pope succeeded another in quick succession, elevated by one faction, to be dethroned, imprisoned, and sometimes murdered by another. The anarchy and confusion which reigned in Rome at length passed the bounds of endurance; and Otho the Saxon, the second restorer of the Western Empire, was invoked by the Pope himself to take Rome beneath his protection. He caused John XII. to be deposed and Leo VIII. to be elected, but he had no intention of permitting the Pope's election to be free, which, after the deposition of Benedict V., was not thought of for more than a century. Without the Emperor the Pope was powerless, tossed about between the contending factions of Roman nobles, and the Emperor made choice of the most pliant tool, in preference to the more worthy candidate for the Papacy. We need not follow this painful history, but will pass on to the time when Henry III. attempted to raise the Papacy from its low abasement. After this the Popes were no longer the subservient vassals of the Emperor, but the strenuous assertors of the rights of the Church. Yet resolute as was their conduct in the investiture controversy, their temporal position was still weak and insecure. Gregory VII., although at first he ruled Rome with a strong hand, was compelled to unite with the Normans of Lower Italy to protect himself from the increasing power of the Imperial faction at Rome. By this faction his successor, Victor III., was driven to seek an asylum in France; and Urban II., one of the most powerful Popes out of Rome, was absolutely powerless in the city itself, being robbed of his revenues, and subsisting for a long time on the alms of the faithful. During the reigns of his successors the Italian nobles were constantly stirring up revolts, and in one of these Lucius II. perished by a violent death. The Popes had no power to prevent the Emperors from seizing on the legacy of the Countess Matilda, and it was not until the time of Innocent III. that the patrimony of S. Peter really came into the possession of the see of Rome.

Innocent was the first Pope who may be called a temporal prince, but his authority was acknowledged by the other cities of the States long before it was recognized at Rome. There he had the toughest resistance to overcome, and was sometimes obliged to

quit the city, until at last he persuaded the Romans to permit him to nominate the chief captain of their municipality, who was called the senator. Most of the power thus gained was soon, however, lost again in the conflict with Frederick II. The struggles of the Guelph and Ghibbeline parties now succeeded, and so completely entangled all the cities of the patrimony in their feuds, that they were unable even to afford the Pope a maintenance. After the elevation of the house of Anjou to the Sicilian throne, the Popes lost the leadership of the Guelphic party. The French influence now predominated, and the Popes submitted to the yoke. The court of Rome was transferred for seventy years to Avignon, and the Papacy was as completely subjected to France as Napoleon himself could have desired. Italian nationalism had not, however, died out; it had only slumbered for awhile, until the oppression of the French legates wakened it from its sleep; and now when the grass was growing in the streets of Rome, and the population numbered only 17,000, the city was roused to a sense of the loss it had sustained in the removal of the Papal court to Avignon. Thence arose that momentous schism which saw rival Popes ruling at Avignon and Rome. In 1418 the schism terminated in the election of Martin V. as sole Pope, but the recognition of his temporal power was by no means universal. Now soon the policy of nepotism began, and the Papal provinces, which the Popes were unable themselves to rule, were granted as fiefs to their relations. This could not, however, long prevail, since the reigns of individual Popes were of short duration, and succeeding Popes had no interest in protecting grants made to the families of their predecessors. It was at length totally abolished by Pius V., who prohibited in the most emphatic manner every endowment of what was a property of the Roman Church, under whatsoever title or pretence it might be made.

It is now time that we should take a glance at the internal regulation of the Roman Government. Its external aspect was never such as to command respect from the European nations, and we fear that at home the Pope, as a rule, was never the subject of any very enthusiastic loyalty. It is a mistake to suppose the Pope to resemble the President of a Republic. The Statute of Eugenius IV., which provided that the Cardinals should take part in the Government, very soon became a dead letter, and the Popes acted as absolute rulers. The office of the College of Cardinals has been only to listen to Papal allocutions and witness the publication of treaties. The original intention of the College as a chapter to advise the Bishop appears to have been long lost sight of. But although the Cardinals have no official voice in the Government, the administration is always entrusted to Ecclesiastics. This has been the case since the sixteenth century. Previous to 1550 laymen frequently acted as chiefs of the administration. From that

time Ecclesiastical Government became the rule. Many cities preferred "*Prelati*" to temporal Governors, and most of all they delighted in the Government of a relative of the Pope. The reason of this is easily understood, when we consider the influence which the relation was supposed to possess with the Pope. Fermo, until the year 1676, maintained its right to have a relative of the Pope as its governor, and after that time a college of Prelati succeeded to his place. Sextus V. developed the prelature as a class to which all the higher official trusts were committed. Those who entered it were required to prove that they were possessed of an income of 1500 scudi, and thus whilst a means of honourable employment was opened to the wealthy, the needy were entirely excluded, however great might be their talents. The foundation of this class led to the establishment of places for them to fill, which were often articles of sale. No salary was attached to their offices, but they made what they could by fees and other profits. In the time of Leo X. there were 3500 such officers, but what they could all find to do we are left to guess. The Prelature established a very marked barrier between the Ecclesiastics and laity, and the privileges of the former naturally created a jealousy, to which all the discontent which has prevailed throughout the Papal states may be attributed. This, however, has not been the only evil. Whatever their spiritual Government might be, their temporal Government was subject to continual change. Old men who had taken no part in the administration of affairs, whilst they were Cardinals, found themselves suddenly elevated to the Papal chair, and the principal offices of state passed into new hands on every fresh election. No line of policy could, therefore, ever receive a fair trial, and the statesman's art could never be matured by experience. The Pope, moreover, had power to interfere arbitrarily in every department of justice, and could withdraw both suits and suitors from the jurisdiction of the regular judges.

Such was the Papacy when Napoleon I. despoiled Pius VII. of the Papal States. He was actuated by no ambition of gaining possession of the territory of the Church, but simply by the desire to convert the Pope into a political tool, whereby nations might be subjected to his imperial sway. Napoleon, however, did not succeed; threats and entreaties were alike unavailing; and the momentary weakness, which had betrayed the Pope into signing the concordat at Fontainebleau, was speedily repaired. Rome had, as when the Popes sojourned at Avignon, suffered from the absence of the Papal Court, much as London would, if her year should ever be without "*a season*;" and therefore, when the Pope returned to Rome, his return was a triumphal procession.

The treaty of Vienna gave the Pope more absolute possession of the Papal States than he had ever received before. Now was the time for Reformation. Traditional customs and privileges had

perished in the interregnum, and the way was open for the introduction of an entirely new system of government. The old grievance, however, was revived, and no place was found in the administration for the laity. Unity and uniformity were the images which floated before the mind of Consalvi, to whom the reconstruction of the State was committed; and an Ecclesiastical Government on a French model was the result. All the old municipal and provincial institutions were abolished, and in their place the States were parcelled out into seventeen legations, over each of which a Cardinal was appointed to preside. The *delegati*, who corresponded in position to the French Prefects, were to be members of the Prelature. Everything was subject to their decision. The council appointed to assist them was nominated by the Pope. All the magistrates who carried on the Government of the Communes were appointed by them, and amongst these sat clergymen, who always took precedence of the laity. In Rome the old supreme authorities were re-established. The congregazione della consulta, del buon governo, economica, dell' acque, degli studii was formed; and over all the Camera Apostolica, divided into twenty-one subordinate departments, was appointed with a Cardinal Chamberlain, and a Treasurer to each. The Cardinal state secretary sat at the head of affairs, as well temporal as spiritual. Fifteen different Courts of Judicature were established; and with such complicated machinery, it is hard to understand how any Government could be carried on. Consalvi's ministry was eminently unpopular, but it was destined to be of no long duration, for in 1823 Pius VII. died and was succeeded by Leo XII., a sickly and infirm old man, who altogether changed his predecessor's policy. The provincial councils were abolished and the Inquisition re-established. An extensive spy system was adopted which took cognizance of the actions of every individual. Next came Pius VIII., whose policy did not materially differ from that of his predecessor, yet it must be recorded to his praise that one of his first acts was to abolish the spy system. The reign of Gregory XVI. was of more importance. Shortly after his accession to the Papal dignity, even whilst the conclave was still sitting, an outbreak occurred, and the insurgents gathered together a congress of popular representatives, who declared that the Pope was deprived of his temporal sovereignty. Rome remained loyal, but outside of the city, most of the Papal officials were constrained to abandon their posts. The appearance of the Austrian soldiers soon regained peace at the bloodless price of an amnesty, which was extended to all, with the exception of thirty of the principal leaders.

The memorandum of May 31, 1831, which was subscribed by the great powers, recommended that improvements should be introduced into the Papal Government, and the laity be admitted into all government offices. It further advised, that there should be an independent local government of the Communes, through

elected councils ; that the provincial councils should be restored, and finally, and what was more important than all, that there should be internal security against the changes incident to an elective sovereignty.

To Copi was committed the charge of drawing up a new scheme of government, but he could effect nothing, when every important change was rejected by Gregory and the majority of the Cardinals. Gregory's policy was to leave things as they were, since he was an old man, and a younger Pope might succeed him, who would expect to live long enough to see the work of reformation completed. The story of the remaining portion of this Pope's reign is soon told. No sooner had the Austrians withdrawn, than the uproar broke out anew. The moderate party, who would have been content if the memorandum had been acted on, were overborne by the radicals, who demanded the annihilation of the government. The time for reformation was passed, and if concessions had now been made, all would have been lost. The Austrians returned to the Pope's defence, and the French took up their post at Ancona. Political assassinations abounded, and espionage was again resorted to, as an almost needful expedient. The Swiss troops afterwards replaced the French and Austrian, and throughout the rest of this reign, a standing military commission maintained the peace of Rome. England has been, we think, to blame. Diplomatic relations were renewed with Rome, when Lord Minto was sent as ambassador, with instructions to promise the Pope support in carrying out the memorandum of 1831, but the clamour of public opinion was a main ingredient in the frustration of the scheme, and since Lord Minto was recalled, the influence of England has never been used in a manner calculated to bring about a political reformation in Rome.

Pius IX. ascended the Papal chair, a professed reformer, and had circumstances permitted, he would, we believe, have proved true to his promises ; but the persons who clamoured for reform, were just those who, by their violence, rendered all concessions dangerous. An allocation, on the 23rd of April, 1848, reminded the Cardinals of the memorandum of 1831, and that, although his predecessors had done some things and promised others in that direction, enough had not been effected either to satisfy the great powers, or to promote peace and tranquillity in the state. Commissions were now appointed for the examination of the whole system of government : liberties, which could be safely conceded, were no longer withheld, and a convocation of notables from the provinces were summoned to a state consultation. Rome had now a communal representation, and the Pope was hailed as the restorer of Italian liberty. But the people were not prepared to make a wise use of their gift. The political clubs became rampant, and under the mask of demonstrations of respect and gratitude, endeavoured to convert the Pope

into a tool of Mazzini. The tide of revolution was already spreading through Europe, when the Pope declared that he would not show less confidence in his people, than had been done in neighbouring states, where the population had been entrusted, not only with a representation, having the capacity to consult together, but also with the power to resolve and to have their decrees carried into effect. Such prerogatives he proposed to confide to two chambers, one to be named by himself, and the other to be elected by the people. The designs of the Pope were however frustrated by the jealousies which divided the interests of the ecclesiastics and the laity. The clergy would not concede, and the laity would not be satisfied, until all jurisdiction was withdrawn from the clergy. A revolution followed, and the Pope fled to Gaeta. When Pius IX. was brought back by the aid of the French bayonets, a new administration arose under Antonelli, whose policy was to restore the previous form of government. Concessions had been so unwisely used, that we cannot wonder that a conservative policy was adopted; nevertheless, by the institution of the "Staats Consulta," laymen received a right of giving their opinion on domestic concerns, although all decision on these was reserved for the Prelati, into whose hands all the chief offices of state were again entrusted.

So has the Papal government continued, weak, despised, and powerless, too mild in its rule to protect individuals from personal injury, and yet too despotic to gain the confidence of the people. Robberies and assassinations are too often perpetrated with impunity, whilst the prisons of Rome are filled with persons who have committed very trifling offences. A maid servant is liable to punishment, if she should fail to inform the inquisition of any one in the house in which she lives, who has eaten meat on a Friday or Saturday evening. There is no uniformity of law, and the justice, dealt to clergy and laity, is unequal. That wretched man Achilli, although convicted and condemned for shameful crimes, was actually promoted to a professorship in the College of Minerva at Rome, and was afterwards sent as a preacher to Capua.

All men are agreed that the present condition of things cannot long remain. It is disgraceful for a sovereign to be upheld by foreign bayonets in his own states. The Pope cannot reform the abuses of his government, because all attempts have hitherto failed. He cannot resign his temporal power, because, as an elected sovereign, he holds it as a trust to be transmitted to posterity. That he should become the subject of any state would place in the hands of that state so powerful an instrument of influence, that we do not believe it would be permitted by the other European powers. To transplant the Papacy to France was the ambition of the first Napoleon, and the idea is inherited by his nephew; but Austria will remember the history of Avignon. What, then, is the Pope to do? Perhaps his more dignified course, if he feels it impossible

to yield up his temporal power, is to sit still and watch the issue of events, to wait in dignity and honour, as the senators were found when the Gauls entered Rome, and then that which he cannot yield up will be wrested from his hand. And when that time shall come, he may be satisfied that he has done his duty, and that his just claims are only relinquished on compulsion; and then, released from the cares of government and the anxieties of empire, he will have leisure to devote his attention, whole and undivided, to that which, after all, is his more proper concern,—the care of all the Churches. Now the Papal government is connected in the minds of the people with misrule and lawless oppression; but when all this is cleared away, we believe that the See of Rome will exercise a far more powerful influence over the hearts of the Italian people than she ever could have done whilst she was encumbered by temporal authority. An Italian Reformation may then be expected, but not, we believe, until then. Amidst the turmoil of civil strife, neither the Court of Rome nor the people can set themselves to the task with that calmness which is needful for so great a work.

Protestantism in Italy can never prevail; it is unsuited to the genius and temperament of the people. When Protestantism was young and vigorous, whilst it laid Germany low beneath its feet, and gained a large measure of influence in France, in Italy it could effect nothing; and now, when it is old, decrepid, and worn out, its prospects are no brighter than of old. At a recent meeting of the Protestant Alliance at Geneva, the confession was made that the labours of the Protestant missionaries had been attended with very little success. Infidelity, meanwhile, predominates; but out of this God in His Providence may bring good. Infidelity can never long prevail: it may be the fashion of a time, but men stand in need of religion, and eventually they must work back their way to a system of belief which will influence their lives, and sustain, by its consolations and hopes, their hours of darkness and sorrow; and whilst the people will desire to return to the faith which they have forsaken, the Roman Church may retreat from the extravagant pretensions by which infidelity was fostered, and present itself in a form more gentle and attractive to its returning children. Bereft of secular power, she will have greater moral influence; and where the Inquisition failed, the preaching of the Gospel shall win an easy victory.

But, meanwhile, what shall be the political condition of the Pope? We do not see much probability of his being allowed to "*retain Rome with a garden.*" Rome will be wanted as the metropolitan city of the United Italian Kingdom; and if it were not, and its possession could be secured to the Pope, the burden of secular government would still weigh down the energy of his spiritual authority, and the discontent of the Roman people would be

increased, when they found that they alone were subjected to ecclesiastical rule. It is true that a constitution might be granted them; but, in their present temper, such a constitution, as would satisfy them, would be little short of a revolution.

Shall Rome, then, be the seat of Victor Emmanuel's government, and the Pope a subject of the Italian King? This is a position which would, we think, be most detrimental to the interests of the Church. Such a juxtaposition of the spiritual and temporal power in Rome the world has never yet seen. After peace was given to the Church, the Emperors ceased to reside at Rome, and then the Popes became virtually independent. If the era of Charlemagne be claimed as an exception, we must remember that this was an age in which kings were the nursing fathers and queens the nursing mothers of the Roman Church. To think that Victor Emmanuel could be a second Charlemagne is to suppose that the leopard would change his spots and the Ethiopian his skin. Oppression of the Church has marked his whole career. We must remember the dissolution of the religious houses in Sardinia, and the imprisonment of the Archbishop of Pisa because he forbade his clergy to sing "*Te Deum*" on the annexation of the Italian states; and with these reminiscences in our mind, we cannot believe that the Church of Rome could possess that freedom of action which is necessary to her influence, if the Pope should ever become the subject of Victor Emmanuel.

An honourable exile would be far preferable, and such a destiny is that which Dr. Döllinger supposes to be now impending; but the exile will not, he thinks, be one of long duration. Rome, deserted by the Pope, will be somewhat as she was when the Papal Court was transferred to Avignon. Rome, the seat of Victor Emmanuel's government, would not be very different from Turin. Instead of being the world-city of the Church, it would be reduced to being the metropolis of a second-rate kingdom. The vast influx of foreigners whom the Papal Court attracts would be seen no more. The solemnities of S. Peter would be wanting, and the princely train of Cardinals would have ceased to spend their princely revenues in Rome. The Roman people would feel that the prestige of the Eternal City was removed, and trade destroyed by the departure of the Roman Court; and then they would desire to see again the days of old, and the Pope would be welcomed back amidst the ovations of the entire populace. The traditions of Papal rule would have been broken by the interregnum, and the restored Pope would be enabled to introduce a new scheme of government, from which all trace of old abuses should be obliterated.

If this be the destiny of Providence, it may be well for Rome; but looking forward into the distance, we do not see how all the inconsistencies which arise from the union of the temporal and

spiritual power could be remedied, if the Papacy should be restored to her secular dominion. The sword of justice was never committed to the Church, and we think she cannot wield it without injury to her more proper influence. The words of Dr. Pusey, spoken at the meeting of the Central African Mission, at Oxford, are we think most true, that it is a sin for a Christian Bishop to interfere in matters of blood. Whatever may have been rendered lawful by a degraded state of society, we cannot imagine the Church to be in a healthy condition, when the power of the sword is entrusted to her chief Bishop.

We believe that there is a middle course. We believe that the Pope may be the subject of no earthly Prince, and that his Court may remain at Rome within a precinct, which shall be exempt from all civil jurisdiction, while the seat of the Italian Government may be established in close proximity. The great Powers of Europe may guarantee the independence of the Pope, and thus, whilst Victor Emmanuel ruled at S. Angelo, the Vatican would be as free from his power, as a foreign ambassador's house is held to be by the law of nations. Then released from political embroilment and civil government, the rule of the Church would be the Pope's only care. Its reformation might be then accomplished, and the Pope remembering the words of our SAVIOUR, spoken to S. Peter, "*When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren,*" would stretch forth his hands to the Churches which had ceased to own his authority, and that union would be established, to which the longing anticipations of thoughtful men in England, France, and Germany are turned. "The Church of the Future" would then indeed be a glorious prospect. General Councils might again be gathered, and the united Church would not only prove a mighty bulwark against infidelity and scepticism, but a most powerful engine for the evangelization of such portions of the world as still lie in darkness. The College of Cardinals might consist of the representatives of the National Churches of Christendom who, gathering around the throne of the first Patriarch of the Church, would be his chapter for advice and counsel.

These things, however, lie far in the future. There is much to be done in the interim. The Latin Church must be reformed; but although we may be over sanguine in our expectations, we may without blame look forward to the end, and welcome all events which prepare the way for its accomplishment. All who feel the import of the SAVIOUR's prayer, that His Church might be One, will sympathise with us in our ardent desire that the rents in the seamless robe of CHRIST may once again be repaired, and the unity of CHRIST's Body acknowledged from one end of the earth to the other.

CLERGY RELIEF.

A Bill [as amended by the Select Committee] for the Relief of Persons in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, declaring their Dissent therefrom. Prepared and brought in by MR. BOUVERIE and MR. EDWARD ELLICE. Ordered by the House of Commons to be Printed, May 22, 1862.

WE imagine this to be one of the smallest Bills that has passed through Committee in the House of Commons. It is barely two pages in extent, and does not occupy a hundred lines altogether. The seven sections into which it is divided, are very brief, and very simple; so that we shall be enabled to give the *entire Bill* in our pages. Would that its import was as harmless as its bulk is small; that its utter weakness and feebleness of construction might but symbolize the range of its mischief, if ever it should have the misfortune to be embodied in an Act of Parliament. As we conclude our reading of this miserable production, the sacred words come into one's mind, "Ἰδοὺ ὀλίγον πῦρ ἡλίαν ὕλην ἀνάπτει." Yet insignificant as this production is, it has a full meaning and a deep significance. The small particles of stubble that fly before the breeze, are in themselves of no account, yet they tell a tale by their very motion, of the quarter whence the wind is blowing, the direction in which the current is setting in. Mr. Bouverie's measure is in this way a sign of the times, an indication that men would do well to mark with a careful eye, nor by any means to pass it by with a heedless or a scornful eye. The gentlemen whose names are prefixed to this Bill, are for many causes deserving our respect and sympathy—they see an evil through coloured media, it may be—but they see an evil, and as the representatives of a class, they propose a practical means for its alleviation; we wish to cast no imputations of any kind upon these gentlemen; we wish to deal with the Bill as with a thing *ἀνόχτιστος*, that as such we may discuss it with perfect freedom and impartiality; may point out its dangerous and anti-Christian tendencies; its complete inability to do that which it proposes to be able to do; and finally, to urge upon all our readers, to use their strongest influence to prevent its ever disgracing the statute-book of our country.

Before proceeding to notice the Bill in detail, a few general remarks are deemed to be advantageous. I. The Bill sets at nought the *Divine Grace of Holy Orders*. It does not do this in words, but in effect, for it enables any man at pleasure to place himself in the position of a mere layman. It assumes that the state Church has a certain power to confer a given legal *status* to a body of men who are associated with her under particular binding obligations,

and that the state Church has the power to withdraw that legal status when the obligations under which it was conferred are dissolved. The Bill does not say that there is no grace or efficacy in Holy Orders, or that a person retiring from a clerk into a lay person, relinquishes that grace and returns to his Bishop the supernatural power with which he was invested. It simply ignores the spiritual element of orders altogether. We trust that all our readers will agree with us, in considering that the union of the Church with the state is a matter of mere circumstance or accident, or to speak more reverently, of a special providence: that the holy Catholic Church—the spouse of CHRIST—the spiritual mother of all her regenerate, has her own divine and glorious kingdom which is “not of this world;” that the Church is but in part visible, but that her largest portion is invisible and out of sight; that she is the depository of certain high and special gifts, in the very right and virtue of which she is a Church at all; that her two divinest tokens are succession and tradition, from which flow her determination of what is the canon of Holy Scripture, and her guardianship of that canon, and her grace of orders, her power of the keys, and above all that tremendous efficacy, by which, through the act of priestly consecration, the elements of the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of CHRIST her SAVIOUR, her High Priest, her incarnate King. Powers such as these, mysterious, awful and divine, are neither given by man, nor by man can be taken away—they are powers of which the HOLY GHOST is the special channel of communication. Without these powers, the Holy Catholic Church is a delusion and a sham—nay, more, a fearful form, and a practical blasphemy against God the HOLY GHOST. It is these notes and tokens that so infallibly distinguish the Church of God, “the pillar and ground of the truth,” from all the religious schisms and sects with which, in these unhappy days, the world abounds. Take away from the Church her supernatural grace, and a form is left without the substance; a body without a soul; an image, but not a being endowed with life; a something that is truly a nothing. The Bill before us treats of Holy Orders as if they had no divine grace, as if they gave no “commission,” and doing this, the Bill strikes at the root of the Church’s life, and denies her faith.

II. This Bill not only sets at nought the doctrine of faith, but overthrows that *discipline* which the Church has held from the beginning. Directly the Jewish polity became at all consolidated; even while it was in a transition and an imperfect state of development, the ALMIGHTY chose a certain tribe to stand before Him for ever; and when the Tabernacle is set up in Shiloh, and the remainder of the land of Canaan is apportioned out by Joshua by lot, he says, “The Levites have no part among you; for the Priesthood of the LORD is your inheritance” (Josh. xviii. 7). Again, when in consequence of the sins of the sons of Eli, the priesthood was to be trans-

ferred from his house, we read, "And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left in thine house, shall come and crouch to him for a piece of silver and a morsel of bread, and shall say, Put me, I pray thee, into one of the *Priest's offices* (*μίσαν τῶν ἱερατῶν*) that I may eat of a piece of bread," (1 Sam. ii. 36). What would have been easier than for the members of a degraded family to have sought for other employment? the fact that the censures under which they lay, were spiritual, would have rendered the other tribes more ready to do something for them to help them. A large community will always admit of the absorption of a certain number of its members into the entire mass, when from some extraordinary cause, the civil equilibrium has met with a temporary derangement, and the descendants of the house of Ithamar might, in other words, have been secularized or disenfranchised. But this was not to be, the restrictions and privileges which they enjoyed in the time of the prosperity of their house, could not be withdrawn in the time of its adversity. Once a Levite, always a Levite. The outward service of the Levite was bound up with a divine call and separation, the office could *not* be *laid* down at pleasure, however unworthy its immediate holders might be. There is something eminently mournful in the words put in the mouth of a descendant of a sacred and time honoured house, "I cannot dig, I may not trade, and buy and sell, and get gain. I have no land, no flocks and herds; I am ashamed to beg." "Put me, I pray, into one of the *Priest's offices*," for I must live, if ever so poorly; I cannot starve; give me any sacred employment, "that I may eat a piece of bread." A request made too with crouching and craving in the last stage of abject servility. Truly this little episode affords one moral to Mr. Bouverie's Bill. When the Christian dispensation came in, the same law served to enforce the indelibility of Holy Orders by a tacit consent without any legal stipulations. Our blessed LORD called His disciples and they *followed* Him; they gave up their living to go about with Him; and they who would not give up their all, wife, parents, and house, and land, for the kingdom of heaven's sake, were by His divine lips pronounced to be unworthy of that kingdom. How stern does the decree seem to us now, "Let the dead bury their dead, but follow thou Me;" how terrible the words, "Whoso putteth his hand to the plough, and looking back, is not fit for the kingdom of God."

The example set by the twelve Apostles was doubtless followed by the Seventy who were sent forth two and two. Throughout the Gospels it is implied again and again, that the calling to preach the Gospel was an honour which was fixed and determinate, that it was a calling not to be taken up to-day and put down to-morrow, but that its acceptance involved the devotion to its service of the remainder of a life. After the Ascension, when the first priestly Act of Consecration had been consummated, we find that ordina-

tion became of the nature of a sacrament as we Anglicans define the word—there was an outward and visible sign, the imposition of hands; accompanied by an invisible spiritual grace, the power of the keys and of consecrating the most Holy Eucharist. Afterwards, when S. Paul had been miraculously converted and had received a commission neither from nor by men, but by the revelation of JESUS CHRIST, he was set apart or separated with S. Barnabas to the work he had in hand. The New Testament Churches had their Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, besides Deaconesses and certain other offices in minor orders, and whatever may have been the case with the third, the ordinations of the two former were certainly indelible. As we descend to the second and third centuries we mark that the very tone by which the “clerics” are distinguished from the “laics” is such as to imply that they were two distinct orders of the community, that were never united and never exchanged places with each other. The priesthood was an introduction into an order of men, and into another sphere of life, which as much marked the “spiritual person” as God’s mark upon Cain distinguished him from all the other men of his day. As the Ascetic theology increased in pretension, and monasticism gained a more permanent sway, the separation between the priest and the people became more marked, and the barriers that divided them more insuperable and impassable. We now write under correction, but if our memory serves us rightly, although there are very many canons made at different Councils, both in the east and west which prohibit the clergy from engaging in secular and worldly pursuits, there is not one, except it be the seventy-sixth canon of our own Church, to be mentioned subsequently, that even contemplates the possibility of any “cleric” of his own free will, renouncing his sacred calling, giving voluntarily the lie to oaths the most solemn, contradicting the life and occupation in which he had been for a long time engaged, and seeking to cut himself off from those who were set to be the lights of the world here and the messengers of that world which in all its glory will be revealed hereafter. For a “cleric” to become a “laic” would, in the better days of the Church, have been held to be an act of the most monstrous impiety or diabolical madness, to seek to throw away a high and a heavenly calling, to put away great and holy gifts; to turn back again to weak and beggarly elements of the world would, in early days, have been viewed with extreme abhorrence by all faithful men, Such a crime is a dire breaking of the discipline of the Church.

While the canons by no means contemplate the possibility of any man voluntarily abrogating his priestly function, they nevertheless are obliged to legislate for those extreme cases of moral depravity and heinous crimes which necessitated that the condemned person should be removed from the public ministry of the Church. This sentence in its severest form was not merely a temporary sus-

pension from clerical duties or a deprivation of some ecclesiastical benefice or post of emolument as a mark of punishment ; it went beyond these courses. It was then called *degradation*, and was the most extreme sentence that could be passed. When a priest was to be degraded, he was not merely written to, by his ecclesiastical superiors and informed of the withdrawal of his licence, or that his benefice was to be declared vacant ; the offender was summoned to appear before his diocesan, who asked for the presence of other Bishops at the ceremony, and the criminal priest was then led before them, properly vested, with all his robes on, bearing in his hands a book of the Gospel, and a paten and a chalice. The Bishop then one by one publicly took away all the vestments and the other things, saying, "This, and this, we take from thee, and do deprive thee of the honour of the priesthood ;" and finally, in taking away the last sacerdotal vestment, saying thus : "Auctoritate Dei Omnipotentis Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ac nostrâ, tibi auferimus habitum clericalem, et deponimus, degradamus, spoliamus, et exuimus te omni ordine, beneficio et privilegio clericali." (Decret. vi. l. v. t. 9, c. 2.) This is the kind of exemption from the service, that the canons granted to those in Holy Orders. Conceive for a moment a man desiring of his own free will, the highest and most summary punishment that it is in the power of any fellow man to inflict. It would sound almost like a fable if we read of an Alexandrian clergyman going to his Bishop, S. Athanasius, and gravely telling him that he had altered his mind since he took his ordination vows, that he could not longer subscribe formulas which then gained his assent ; concluding his speech by requesting the saint to depose and to degrade him from his office. Picture a similar scene with S. John Chrysostom, at Constantinople ; with S. Ambrose, at Milan ; with S. Cyprian, at Carthage ; with S. Leo the Great, at Rome ; with S. Theodore or S. Anselm, at Canterbury ; with S. Wilfrid, at York. Why should an act sound as fiction or romance when enacted in the third, fourth, seventh, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, and be gravely legislated for as a most natural proceeding in the nineteenth century ? Is it because the Church's discipline is almost broken up and destroyed ? because Erastianism has almost eaten out her energy or her life to its very core ? This is a grave question indeed to agitate, graver than men think it is ; for the Church and the world are not *one* ; the shifting morality of the latter can in no wise apply to the immutable principles of the former.

III. This Bill in its principles not only contradicts the faith and discipline of the Church of England, as being a true and living branch of the Catholic Church ; but it is, moreover, in itself a most *inexpedient* measure. We are, all of us, too apt to regard vows and obligations which may be easily broken as of far less serious import than those which once made are perpetually binding. We

do not hesitate to affirm that the general bearing of the marriage law as it stands at present does much more than contradict the plain teaching of the Gospel upon the nature of that sacrament ; it leads people to look upon the sacred obligation which is involved in the marriage vow as one that may be broken, one that is by no means so indissoluble as our forefathers were taught to believe. This notion will greatly augment the number of imprudent marriages. Marriage is becoming more common ; it is undertaken in a lighter spirit now that its solemnity and seriousness is so considerably diminished. The number of unhappy and ill-assorted marriages has been fearfully on the increase since the present law has been in operation. Mr. Bouverie's Bill would have upon the candidates for the office of the priesthood some such inexpedient influence as that of which we have just made mention. It would induce many a young man "to try the Church for a year or so:" and then, if he found the restraints upon his personal habits too burdensome ; or the clerical life to be too "slow ;" or that he was "unsuccessful as a preacher ;" or that he was disappointed in his hopes of preferment ; or that he failed to acquire any influence in the parishes in which he was called upon to minister ; instead of seeking for aid in these and other difficulties and perplexities whence aid alone can flow ; instead of trying to correct by self-discipline those needs in himself of which his experience has now for the first time made him conscious : he will be tempted to try a new sphere of life, and one in which he *now* imagines he can reasonably entertain hopes of a better success. All this is very bad indeed ; all this *must* bring great scandal upon the Church of God. How will the world respect a Church that fosters such a principle as this ; how confounded would the parish priest feel in meeting with the most wealthy and important of his parishioners, and being informed by him, "Oh, I was a parson once myself, but I found that the Church did not pay in these days, so I signed a declaration that I dissented from the discipline of the Church. I do not hold, you know, with the union of Church and State. I obtained discharge ; and I can assure you that I never regretted the step ; indeed, if one's friends had not wished it, I do not think that I should ever have gone into orders at all." Should the present measure become the law of the land we should hear of analogous cases to the one supposed, and that not here and there, but in great numbers. With the dishonour so done to the sacred offices of God, would be attached a vast degradation to the clergy as a body, as well as a general lowering of the dignity of the Church in the eyes of the people. May God of His mercy protect us from such a state of things as this. And is it not a mild form of speech to say that this Bill is socially *inexpedient* ?

IV. Is there no relief, then, to be granted to persons of distressed consciences ? Let us look at the matter a little in detail.

A liberal education, which in most cases is ensured by the possession of a degree granted by one of our great universities, added to which is a long examination, precedes the admission of any candidate to the office of Deacon in the Church of England. Before such admission can take place, the young man must be at least twenty-three years of age. Again, the act that he is going to do is not one that depends upon any momentary feeling, or any sudden and undue action of the affections: it is an act that must have met with the calm determination of his deliberate judgment for some years before it was committed. The candidate for Holy Orders has, if a man has opportunity for anything, an ample leisure to weigh the importance of the solemn step that he is going to take, to judge of his own fitness or unfitness for the work; so that, if he has engaged himself in this solemn calling without such due forethought and self-examination, and awakes to find out the mistake that he has, through his own carelessness, (to use no harder term,) committed, he *deserves no relief*, nor pity, nor sympathy, but a strong arm to be applied to him, to compel him, as far as possible, to do his duty in his self-sought calling. There are others of a higher order of mind, whose opinions have been slowly undergoing a change for years past, and now it seems to them dishonest to continue in their present ministration. To such as these we say that *there is relief enough as the law at present stands*. They can withdraw from their posts of religious teachers, the pen or the schoolroom always affording a sufficient maintenance to men such as would belong to this class. In this way no scandal is brought by them upon the Church; no churches are ill served; the feelings of no congregation are shocked; the extreme latitude of opinion that is tacitly allowed in the Church of England is seized on by them, and, not being publicly engaged in religious teaching, in private they may hold their own. But such a class as this will ever be in the minority. The mass of men move with the stream: and the Paraclete, which will abide in the Church for ever, will lead the bulk of her priests in the way of Catholic Truth. It must not be forgotten that those for whom this Bill is principally drawn up belong to this very small class. The recent attacks upon the sacred Canon have, without exception, proceeded from men who, although clergymen by profession, yet passed all their best years as teachers and professors in our colleges and universities. They commenced their career as college fellows, tutors, and lecturers, and brought with them to their parochial charges—as many as have left the university, that is—the feelings, studies, and habits of literary research which belonged to their former lives. Such gentlemen as these, represent but an infinitesimal portion of the parochial clergy of the Church of England. The great bulk of the clergy have neither the time nor the requisite learning, nor, happily, the disposition to investigate dis-

puted and dangerous topics. It is notorious how the hard duties of practical life wear down all undue attempts at a false speculation or theorising.

V. There is another, although it is a very minor consideration, when compared with the others: the Bill will not be able to effect the object which it aims at accomplishing. It may allow the clergyman, without any penalties being imposed upon him, to degrade himself into a mere layman, but cannot compel the Inns of Court to allow him to become a member of either of their corporations, and so prepare himself to plead at the English bar, any more than it can demand his enrolment amongst the fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons or of the College of Physicians. The self-degraded clergyman would be too old to enter the army or the navy; the latter at all, or the former, except under very unfavourable circumstances. Society would have a just and wholesome dread of this pseudo-clergyman; all the learned professions would be closed against him; trade or commerce, for which he would be by his previous training but ill fitted, would be his only resource. The more respectable of the dissenting bodies of this country would shun any of their schismatic teachers who retired from his religious teaching, and devoted himself to a secular calling. As the stupendous gifts which accompany the imposition of hands can never be washed away,—as this Bill offends against the law of God and of the Church—as it is both inexpedient and inoperative, it is our duty most strongly to protest against its ever passing into the law of the Church.

VI. Lastly, it may be asked, shall we retain bad men in the holy offices of our Church, and not seek to be rid of them, as they may be willing to escape from us? Our remarks upon the sons of Eli are somewhat to the purpose; these fallen descendants were to be put into one of the Priest's offices for a morsel of bread. Again, the case of Judas Iscariot is quite in point: "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" said our Blessed LORD. Yet this "devil," known to be an evil man by CHRIST long before the betrayal, was not by Him expelled from the fellowship of the other eleven; the good and the bad, until the harvest, were to be together. If our LORD and Master allowed a "devil" in the sacred college itself, we can surely bear with a few indifferent priests in so large a body as is our National Church. But, in very truth, this is all beside the mark; for our worst clergy would never seek their self-degradation through such a Bill as this; they are the men to crave the "morsel of bread," to hold on to their preferment to the very last. This Bill will not rid the Church of one unworthy minister. Indifferent, unworthy men are not usually troubled about points of doctrine; they take things as they find, and that which saves them the most trouble is the view they hold, and the practice that they incline to carry out. The Bill is no

Church Relief Bill ; it is not any amended act of Church discipline, which might recall the slothful to a more energetic discharge of ill-performed duties : would that it were so ! It only seeks to do what is impossible to be done, and what it is impossible to carry out. If no other and graver considerations ranged themselves against this measure, its extreme inadequacy to meet the need in question would be a reason, though not the strongest reason, which would urge us to meet it with the strongest opposition.

We will now proceed to make a few remarks upon the Bill itself. The preamble refers to the 1st of William and Mary, c. 18, and runs thus :—

“Whereas it is expedient to extend the relief provided by an Act passed in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, intituled, ‘An Act for exempting their Majesties’ Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of certain laws,’ to persons who have received Holy Orders, and who shall afterwards have declared their dissent from the doctrines of the United Church of England and Ireland : Be it therefore enacted, by the Queen’s most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same.”

This preamble is based upon the famous Toleration Act of the Dutch William, only, in its mischievous effect, it would far surpass its noted liberal predecessor. We state that this is directly in the teeth of our 76th Canon, which provides in express terms that “no man, being admitted a deacon or a minister, shall from thenceforth voluntarily relinquish the same, nor afterwards use himself in the course of his life as a layman, upon pain of excommunication ; and the churchwardens shall present him.” In the case of *Baines v. Shore*, this Act of Toleration was pressed in every way in favour of Mr. Shore, who tried to escape the consequences of his schismatical rebellion against his diocesan by placing himself in the position of a layman. Lord Denman observed, in giving judgment against Mr. Shore :—“Mr. Shore, therefore, may be entitled to insist upon being treated as a dissenter, upon his mere assertion that he is so, without any formal act of separation being necessary, either by him or against him. But he cannot so divest himself of the character of a Priest in Holy Orders, with which he has been clothed by the authority of the Church of England, when he was ordained by one of her Bishops, and when he vowed and promised canonical obedience to that Church.” “Therefore, although he may as a dissenter be exempted by the 4th Sect. of Stat. 1 Gul. & M. c. 18, from being sued in the Ecclesiastical Court for mere nonconformity to the Church of England, he is not exempt by that or any other Act from canonical obedience to the Bishop as a Priest, in regard to anything that he may do according

to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England." Lord Denman is very clear upon the valuelessness of the Toleration Act to apply to persons in Holy Orders in the Church of England. The selection of that Act as the basis of the present scheme is a most significant token of the temper and spirit in which this present Bill is drawn up, and of the sympathies which the framers have brought to their task.

After the preamble, we read :—

" I. That no person having been ordained to the office of Priest or Deacon, and if a Priest having duly resigned or tendered his resignation of any and every benefice held by him, who shall have given notice in writing to the Bishop of the Diocese wherein he shall then be resident, of his intention to make the declaration hereinafter mentioned, six calendar months at the least before the making thereof, and who shall have made and subscribed a declaration in writing in any Court of Record, which is hereby empowered to receive the same, in the manner hereinafter mentioned in the words following :—' I, A. B., having been ordained a Priest of the United Church of England and Ireland [*or a Deacon, as the case may be*], do solemnly declare that I conscientiously dissent from the doctrine and discipline [*or either of them, as the case may be*] of the said Church : ' And shall have duly delivered or transmitted such declaration to the same Bishop in the manner hereinafter mentioned, shall be subject to any prosecution, proceeding, or punishment, in any Ecclesiastical Court, for thereafter committing any breach of the discipline of the said Church as a person in Holy Orders therein."

We cannot envy the Priest, who has announced to his Diocesan the intention of declaring his faith void and his ministrations null, that day six months, the state of mind in which during that period he must necessarily be placed. The lax form of the declaration does excite all our indignation. Of course it is made as general as it was possible to frame it. But what notion do those words convey to any rational man,—I conscientiously dissent from the discipline of the Church of England? One person may mean one thing by this phrase, and another person another. One man may regret that so much primitive discipline, public penance, and excommunication and the like, have been lost to our Church at present. Another man may wish that the Act of Conformity was abolished, and that each Priest might have a perfect liberty to do what was right in his own eyes. Surely such a vague declaration as this affords every possible encouragement to poor unbeneficed clergymen to seek some other and more lucrative calling when they are tired of an ecclesiastical life.

" II. Every such person shall, within three days of his making the said declaration, transmit or deliver the same, together with his letters of Orders, and a statement under his hand, that such declaration had been duly made in a Court of Record, and a further statement of his then place of residence, to such Bishop."

"III. The Bishop shall, within thirty days of the receipt of such declaration, cause the same to be recorded in his Registry, and thereafter such person shall be incapable in Law of holding any benefice, whether donative or otherwise, and of preaching or officiating in any Office of the Holy Ministry of the said Church : and the Bishop may, if he think fit, further cause to be recorded in his Registry any sentence which it would be competent to any Ecclesiastical Court to pronounce in a suit, properly instituted for that purpose, against a Clerk in Holy Orders, charged with publicly contradicting the doctrine of the said Church and disobeying the lawful authority of his Ordinary, on his confession of such charges, accompanied by a refusal to retract or to render obedience for the future to such authority ; and such sentence shall have the like effect to all intents, and shall be followed by the same consequences as to the ecclesiastical rights and liabilities of such person, as if the same had been duly pronounced by an Ecclesiastical Court having competent jurisdiction in that behalf : provided always that no person shall be ordered by any such sentence or be liable by reason thereof to pay costs : nor shall any person be subject or liable by reason of such sentence, or of his disobedience thereto, to imprisonment, or any other temporal penalty or punishment whatever."

After the record of the declaration in the Bishop's registry, which implies the complete suspension of all ecclesiastical functions in the person making the declaration, the Bishop has the rare privilege of instituting a sort of mock suit, the sentence of which is powerless when pronounced, and the cost of which the Bishop himself is compelled to bear. Mr. Bouverie is very gracious indeed : he will allow a Bishop to enact an ecclesiastical farce upon a very solemn occasion, provided that the said Bishop pay all the expenses of this farce : he may become the dupe of his own whim. We imagine that no Bishop would condescend to such miserable and costly trifling as this would be if this clause in the bill were to be passed, which we venture to predict it most assuredly will not.

"IV. A copy or extract of the Record of such Declaration in the Bishop's Registry, extracted and duly certified by the Registrar of the Bishop, shall be sufficient evidence that such person has duly made and duly delivered or transmitted such declaration in the manner hereinbefore required, and the Registrar shall furnish such copy or extract to such person on payment of a fee not exceeding ten shillings for drawing and entering on record such declaration and for making such copy or extract."

That clause is merely a matter of convenience, and certainly ten shillings is not too much to pay for a legal certificate of apostasy by which the fact of one's voluntary degradation from the Priesthood is placed beyond the shadow of a doubt.

The next portion of the Bill deals a little more with details.

"V. Where any such Priest shall have duly tendered his resignation of any benefice held by him as aforesaid, and such resignation shall not

have been accepted, and such Priest shall make the said declaration, and such benefice is not within the Diocese of the Bishop, whereof such Priest is hereby required to transmit the said declaration, such Priest forthwith, upon making such declaration, shall give notice thereof, and of his having made the same both to the Bishop of the Diocese wherein such benefice is situate and to the Patron of such benefice.

"VI. Every licence, office, and place, whatsoever held by such person, for which it is or may be an indispensable qualification that the holder thereof for the time being should be a minister or member of the said United Church, shall become and be from and after the date of the entry of such declaration in the Registry of such Bishop as aforesaid, *ipso facto*, determined or vacant, as the case may be."

These two sections are connected, and they afford little matter for comment, being regulations that flow naturally from the nature of the case. The remaining section ends the Bill, which we have presented to our readers in full, and so we have carried out our promise which we made at the beginning of these remarks.

"VII. From such date, as aforesaid, such person shall cease to enjoy all rights, privileges, and exemptions to which any person may be entitled as being in Holy Orders in the said Church, or as having been ordained to the office of Priest or Deacon in the said Church, and shall cease to be subject to any disabilities, disqualifications, restraints, restrictions, and prohibitions to which any person is subjected as being in the same Orders, or as having been ordained to such office of Priest or Deacon, any law, custom, statute, rule, or ordinance, civil or ecclesiastical, to the contrary notwithstanding: provided always that nothing herein contained shall qualify any such person to sit in the House of Commons."

Can anything be conceived more arbitrary and unjust than this last clause? The degraded Priest loses the privileges of his order, but then all his ecclesiastical disabilities, *disqualifications*, restraints, restrictions, and prohibitions, as being a Priest, are to be taken off, all but one, a disqualification to some men the most important of all—the being unable to sit in the Lower House of Parliament. The man who would avail himself of this Bill is legally, when its conditions are complied with, either a layman or a Priest still. If he be a layman, in the eye of the Law he has, in common justice, and according to every principle of common sense, a right to all a layman's privileges without a restriction of any kind. It is very easy to guess why this last clause was introduced, but a bill of such lax morality as the one before us seems to have strained off the gnat and swallowed the camel, for it allows a man to set aside oaths the most solemn and vows the most binding, and with a fastidious squeamishness, which is quite unaccountable, hesitates about allowing the poor apostate the chance of procuring an ignominious insignificance amongst the demagogues of the House of Commons.

BRIGHT'S SERMONS OF S. LEO.

Eighteen Sermons of S. Leo the Great on the Incarnation. Translated, with Notes, and with the "Tome" of S. Leo in the original. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A., Fellow and Assistant-Tutor of University College, Oxford. London: Joseph Masters, Aldersgate Street, and New Bond Street. 1862.

THIS is just the kind of book which Mr. Bright's Church History would have led us to expect to proceed from his pen. The same clear and definite views, both of the orthodox faith, and of the various heresies which assailed that faith; the same intense vitality that characterizes his former work, is met with here. This is a great and a rare gift, to be able to bring the severest dogmas of the Catholic faith home to our hearts with a living power. Even the very heresies are no mere abstractions; they are creative personifications of the tenets which they embody. There is no modern theological writer who at all comes near to Mr. Bright in this respect; for he presents the most technical theological formulæ in such striking vestments, that they ever cling to the memory, being considered either as the badges of a school party, or as the representatives of some one of our immortal theologians. Yet this intensity of expression is not purchased at the expense of diffuseness. The little manual of Church history could well have been expanded into a volume three times its present size, without giving rise to any charge of book-making; and the little volume before us is in itself a *compendium of theology*. Half of the volume is filled with notes, which will be found extremely "helpful to those who are beginning the study of theology," (Preface, p. xiii.) and most useful to many an advanced theological scholar, who has not gone over precisely the same ground which has been so accurately surveyed by Mr. Bright. In the Preface Mr. Bright gives a short analysis of the life of S. Leo, embracing all its leading features, and then sums up his leading characteristics as a preacher—his firm union of doctrine and morality—the connection between faith and practice—together with a few hard hits at the "ethical spirit" of the class of men who are to all intents and purposes the Socinians of the day. The following beautifully written passage well illustrates Mr. Bright's vigorous style:—

"In truth S. Leo, as a preacher and writer, may be said to have lived in the light of the Incarnation: that the only-begotten SON, very GOD from all eternity, became very Man of the substance of the Virgin Mary, His Mother, and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin; that in His Death was redemption, reconciliation, propitiation;

that by His Resurrection He unbarred the gate of immortality; that by His Ascension He seated our nature in heavenly places. These things were to him not merely an orthodox formula, but a majestic reality, a living and ineffably precious fact. While he kept a firm hold on that side of it, which in his earlier life had been maintained against Nestorius,—*the unity of our Lord's person*,—he was specially called upon to plead for the kindred verity impugned by Eutyches—*the distinctness of our Lord's natures, Godhead and Manhood*. His writings show how thoroughly he believed that Christians are joined to GOD by CHRIST'S Manhood, and to CHRIST'S Manhood by the right use of CHRIST'S ordinances. How dear to his soul was the revelation of the sympathizing Brother, the Perfect Example, the ever-availing Sacrifice, the Exalted Mediator, the life-imparting Head!"—Preface, p. ix.

Does not this passage illustrate the life-like writing of which we have made mention? We can but barely indicate the titles of some of the notes. Does S. Leo quote Job, (xiv. 4, 5, LXX.) to prove that no one is clear from guilt, not even he who has lived but one day upon the earth, Mr. Bright gives us the opinions of SS. Austin and Chrysostom, with the statements of Dr. Mill upon "the immaculate conception" of the Blessed Virgin. Does S. Leo state that a Royal Virgin is to conceive a divine and human offspring, first in soul and then in body, (*prius conciperet mente quam corpore*,) Mr. Bright illustrates this twofold conception from passages from the writings of S. Augustine. Does S. Leo speak of the Virgin, and of one "who is soon to be mother of God," (*Dei genetrix mox futura*,) Mr. Bright gives us a perfect treatise upon the "Theotokos," in which not the Fathers alone, nor the writings of Bishop Pearson, but Mr. Kingsley, Madame Guyon, and Venantius Fortunatus are pressed into the service. Does S. Leo speak of the particular nature of both substances being preserved, (*salva igitur proprietate utriusque substantiæ*,) Mr. Bright investigates the *communicatio idiomatum* by the light of Eastern Fathers, Holy Scripture, the great Councils, the Schoolmen, and even modern poems. Does S. Leo say that, "unless He were very God, He would not bring us healing," Mr. Bright compares this with other statements of S. Leo, with the dogma of S. Athanasius, with citations from Dean Trench and Mr. Benson upon "the Atonement by a Divine Person." Does S. Leo speak of the things quæ pertinent *ad sacramenta* solemnitis of this day, Mr. Bright gives us the history of the various uses of the word sacramentum. Does S. Leo say that S. Mary had not ceased to be a Virgin, either by bringing forth or by conceiving, Mr. Bright gives us a note upon "the Ever-Virgin." Does S. Leo speak of the soul being lifted up to do homage to its Maker, in oblatione sacrificii, Mr. Bright identifies this unmistakably with "the Eucharistic Sacrifice," and Muratori and Mr. Carter substantiate his views. Does S. Leo quote the "Gloria in Excelsis," Mr.

Bright traces out its liturgical use through all Churches to the present day. Does S. Leo declare that moral people do not belong to God's peace if they are Jews, heretics, or *pagani*, Mr. Bright cites Juvenal, Tacitus, the Theodosian Codex, Pliny, Gibbon, Hooker, Trench, Michelet, Robertson, and others, to clearly define what a Pagan means. Does S. Leo say that our LORD, and those who believed in Him, "*condidit sacramentum et exemplum*," Mr. Bright shows from S. Epiphanius, Dr. Mill, and Dean Trench, how morals are based upon mysteries. Does S. Leo ask "who that is regenerated by that same which conceived CHRIST, has not a *communis natura* with CHRIST?" Mr. Bright confutes Mr. Maurice and his school, by proving from Holy Scripture that our union with CHRIST is supernatural. Does S. Leo promise the remainder of a sermon upon the "*diem sabbati*," Mr. Bright gives an elaborate account of all ceremonies observed upon the "great Sabbath," Holy Saturday, or Easter Eve, with a full detail of the Paschal candle. Does S. Leo say "if any one cannot explain in respect to God, what is, let no one dare affirm what is not," Mr. Bright collects various passages from the several Fathers, to prove that God's essence is above comprehension, and that the Creeds do not explain it. Does S. Leo say "*oportebat enim ut aliquid etiam salvandi pro se agerint*," Mr. Bright explains the teaching of the Catholic Church upon grace and free will. And there are more than a hundred such notes as those of which we have indicated thus roughly the contents, in all of which the undeniable teaching of the Church Catholic is maintained, and the store-houses of the Church's doctrine pointed out. If Mr. Bright had only translated these Sermons in his own beautiful way, he would have conferred a lasting benefit upon the theological literature of our day; but the annotations with which he has enriched them converts the gift into a priceless boon.

If any one would wish to judge of the merits of Mr. Bright's translation, let him compare it with that of some of the homilies which appeared some twenty years ago, under the auspices of Mr. Oakley, with the title, "*Homilies for the Holy Days and Seasons, translated from the Writings of the Saints*." The superiority of Mr. Bright's version will be manifest at once, although the volume in question betrays everywhere the marks of a sound scholarship. In such an easy Latin writer as S. Leo the differences of translation must necessarily be very slight, it is only when we come to read a whole homily in the English, that Mr. Bright's version often appears to be very plain, where Mr. Oakley's is more difficult to follow. In some cases we prefer Mr. Oakley's rendering. We will give our readers a specimen of the text and both versions, taken from a casual homily, Sermon XVI., the second for the Ascension:—

<i>The Text.</i>	<i>Mr. Bright's Version.</i>	<i>Mr. Oakley's Version.</i>
"sacramentum dilectissimi salutis nostræ quam precio sanguinis sui universitatis conditor æstimavit a die corporalis ortus usque ad exitum passionis per dispensationem humilitatis impletum est."	"the sacred work, dearly beloved, of our salvation, which the Maker of the universe valued at the price of His own Blood, was fulfilled, from the day of His corporeal Birth, even to the issue of His Passion, by means of an economy of humiliation."	"the sacrament of our salvation, my most dearly beloved, which the Framer of the universe valued at the price of His own Blood, was in course of fulfilment throughout the whole period of His humiliation, from the day of His Birth in the flesh, until the end of His Passion."
"post passionem vero ruptis mortis vinculis, quæ vim suam in eum qui peccati erat nescius incedendo perdiderat."	"but after the Passion, after the bursting of the bonds of death, which had exposed its own strength by going to attack Him Who knew no sin."	"but after His Passion, when He had broken the bonds of death (who lost her power by attacking Him Who knew no sin)."
"quo naturæ nostræ humilitas in Christo super omnem cœli militiam."	"whereon our lowly nature was in CHRIST advanced above all the host of heaven."	"in which our humble nature was advanced in CHRIST above all the host of heaven."
"nisi in ipsius carne vestigia passionis et visu explorasset et tactu."	"unless he could explore both by sight and touch the traces of the Passion in CHRIST's own flesh."	"till he had first assured himself, both by sight and touch, of the marks of His sufferings remaining on His Person."
"et ut fides excellentior esset ac firrior visioni doctrina successit."	"and that faith might be nobler and firmer, sight was succeeded by doctrine."	"and that our faith might be the more excellent and the more secure, to sight has succeeded authoritative teaching."
"in Christo corporeæ substantiæ, quæ Patre minor est."	"the corporeal substance in CHRIST, wherein He is inferior to the FATHER."	"that bodily subsistence in CHRIST which is less than the FATHER."
"liberos cordis oculos ad illam altitudinem in qua Christus est."	"let us lift up the free eyes of our heart to that height on which CHRIST is."	"let us raise the eyes of our heart, free from worldly objects, to that high place where CHRIST is."
"nisi in suis fomitibus enecetur."	"unless it is killed in that which feeds it."	"unless this be destroyed in its very first springs."
"sine qua nulla virtus potest nitere."	"without which no virtue can shine."	"without which the ornament of no virtue can be obtained."

In this last case Mr. Oakley's translator seems to have followed a different text from that of Ballerini, which is by far the best, and which Mr. Bright has very generally adhered to. In thanking Mr. Bright for his valuable little book, we again say that it exhibits honest, sound scholarship, profound theological knowledge, and a spirit of devotion and Christian charity, which bids fair to throw

its other excellencies into the background. We wish Mr. Bright such success in his present work, that he may be induced to give to the English reader some other equally valuable sermons from some of our greatest divines, the bulk of whom are but at present little known to English Churchmen.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined. By the Right Rev. J. W. COLENSO, Bishop of Natal. Longman and Co.

"THERE is nothing so deceitful as figures," said the late Mr. Canning. And truly Bishop Colenso would have done well to have given heed to this *dictum*, which in regard to ancient documents possesses a truth beyond what it ordinarily bears. But perhaps it could hardly have been expected of the author of a "Complete Arithmetic." Rather he must ride his hobby to death.

Our intention was to have reviewed this book at length; and that we have now changed our purpose is not because we underrate the danger of such publications, when the normal condition of our people is that of practical unbelief; nor yet that we desire to speak contemptuously of Bishop Colenso. But when we came to examine his book, the conviction at once forced itself upon our minds, that the whole basis on which the assault rests is so untrustworthy as not really to deserve any serious reply. It is based upon arithmetical calculations, and these calculations rest on the assumption that all the elements of a safe calculation are at hand. But this is rarely, if ever, the case; and we need not tell any arithmetician if he has one wrong factor in his sum that the product will not be a very reliable quantity.

We will give one illustration of our meaning, and it is borrowed from the very crucial instance in which the untutored Zulu overthrew the faith of the Bishop by the insinuation of a single doubt. The objection which seemed so insuperable to Dr. Colenso was thus put by the native African,—“Do you really believe that all the beasts, and birds, and creeping things upon the earth, large and small, from hot countries and from cold, came thus by pairs, and entered into the ark with Noah? And did Noah gather food for them all, for the beasts and birds of prey, as well as for the rest?”

It would certainly be a very unlikely thing that Noah and his family should have been turned into mere “keepers” of wild beasts. A miraculous element must be supposed in order to preserve peace amongst this motley crowd of animals. And what difficulty can there be in accepting the hypothesis which seems so likely, that these animals were further kept, during their sojourn in the ark, in a state of torpor? The Bishop admits that “the notion of miraculous or supernatural interferences does not present to my own mind the difficulties it seems to present to some.” Suppose such an interference as we have imagined in the present case, and the problem is solved. In a similar way we can believe it possible that answers will be found eventually for most or all of his other difficulties.

One general remark alone will we make. The charge of the Bishop is that the Pentateuch is unhistorical. Undoubtedly it is; it would be unworthy of inspiration to suppose it a mere history, any more than it is a treatise on geology or astronomy. Difficulties derived from any of these sciences, whose path Holy Scripture may from time to time cross, do not trouble us any more than did the discovery, when we first made it, that S. Mark or S. Paul did not write classical Greek.

We cannot resist the temptation of quoting an epigram on Bishop Colenso's book, which we believe was made in Oxford, and which shows the kind of estimation in which the author is held by really learned men.

"There once lived a Bishop Colenso,
Who counted from one up to ten so,
That he found all the writings Levitical
To be indeed very uncritical—
So he went out to tell the black men so."

The English Church Union Kalendar, &c. Masters.

IN publishing a Kalendar for the purpose of advertising themselves the English Church Union only follow an example that has been long since set and extensively imitated. We assume however that they have higher and more disinterested objects at heart—the chief among which we apprehend is the desire to enlist the sympathies of the faithful, as far as possible, in the doctrines, and ritual, and work of the Church.

The "Notes on the Minor Festivals" are among the most useful parts of this compilation, and though somewhat uneven, appear to be carefully done, explaining satisfactorily some difficulties, as e.g., the Commemoration of S. Cyprian on Sept. 26. Many of them however lack the devotional element, being simply historical. The general character of the "Suggestions" as to the right method of performing the various services of the Church, strikes us as being unnecessarily stiff and jejune. In many points we must take leave to say they are beyond all question wrong. Thus it cannot be right to offer the alms *kneeling*, "Near the entrance to *the chancel*" is not the place for women to be churched, but near the entrance to *the church*, as was expressly ordered in the Sarum Office; the Collect for Easter Eve should not be said at first vespers of Easter Day; nor should *Jubilate* be sung on Sundays. The "Guide to the Daily Services," which was always far from accurate, has now been made tenfold more so by an attempt to give the names of the Clergy attached to the several churches.

Silvio, an Allegory chiefly from the MS. of the Rev. W. ADAMS, and edited by C. WARREN ADAMS, (Masters,) will be received with deep interest by all (and they are many) who have profited by the beautiful parables of that gentle teacher who has long since passed from types to reality. Under the simple figure of a child left by his Master to cultivate his garden, we have the Christian's course described with all its temptations and dangers—and although the reader cannot fail to perceive that this fragment is one of Mr. Adams' earliest productions, as the editor states, yet there is quite enough of the fascinating language and pure refined imagination of his maturer works to render this a very welcome addition to them.

MONRO'S PASTORAL LIFE.

Pastoral Life. Part I. The Clergyman at Home and in the Pulpit. By the Rev. EDWARD MONRO, M.A., Vicar of S. John the Evangelist, Leeds. Oxford: Henry Hammans. London: Joseph Masters. 1862.

THE prolific author of the work which stands at the head of this article has already, as most of our readers know, given to the world other treatises bearing on the subject of the ministry and parochial work. And if the present publication travels partly over the same ground as books previously written, we may hope that the additional experience of twelve years has tended to modify Mr. Monro's somewhat exaggerated and dispiriting view of the priest's duties, while it has strengthened his appreciation of those other sides of the sacerdotal character to the equal importance of which he had seemed to be less keenly alive. It will be remembered that in former treatises our author appeared to acknowledge but one type of parish priest, the active, bustling, self-denying, missionary, full of labours and good works, trusting for the conversion of sinners and the edification of the faithful rather to direct and open means, than to quiet intercession, unobtrusive influence, and holy example. Not, of course, that Mr. Monro undervalued such characteristics, but the tendency of his works was to exhibit the former as the normal and necessary ideal of the English clergyman, and so far to cast a shadow of despondency on many, who, while placing great confidence in his teaching, yet felt themselves morally and physically incapable of acting up to his ideal, and who were left with an uneasy consciousness that their own tastes, abilities, and opportunities, led them to give special heed to those very duties which their guide seemed not to regard as of the greatest practical utility. In his present work the author has given freer scope to the poetical temperament with which he is endowed; he has cast a halo of transcendentalism over the hard life of the parish priest, and has exhibited the laborious pastor as one keenly alive to external influences, studying nature with a poet's and a painter's eye, and calling to his aid landscape and colour, stream and tree, bird and flower. The vocation of the parish priest in England especially, where the ministry is a consolidation of many elsewhere separate functions, requires many special gifts, calls into exercise and fully demands every power and faculty with which God has endowed him; and happy is he who is so constituted by nature and assisted by grace as to be able to retain the ecclesiastical spirit in spite of the

VOL. XXV.—FEBRUARY, 1863.

I

many difficulties with which he has to contend, and the antagonism of many of his almost necessary duties.

The present is an instalment of a larger work, which is meant to deal with all the details of pastoral life and occupation. It is to be followed by other volumes treating of Confirmation and First Communion, Parochial Education, and kindred subjects. The work now issued contains thoughts and suggestions on the Clergyman at Home and in the Pulpit, arranged under the several heads of parish scenery, its association and effects; the characteristics of the parish priest; the clergyman's day; and preaching. It will be seen by this account of its contents that the volume is rather desultory and disconnected; but it contains much that is valuable and suggestive, and is worthy of warm welcome from every priest who feels that he has much to learn in his difficult and important work, and who is grateful for the published experience of one possessed of so good a right to teach as the respected Vicar of Harrow-weald.¹

Every well regulated mind is open to the impression of external nature. The aspect of the country wherein a man's lot is cast will insensibly work some effect upon his character, and influence more or less the spirit in which he labours, and in many particulars will give a special direction to his thoughts. Thus, without being guilty of sentimentalism, we may say that the parish priest does and ought to feel this power in an eminent degree. He more than any man should recognise the teaching of physical scenery, trace its allegorical meaning, and enter into the philosophy of that deep connection between man and the inanimate creation around him, of which most men are conscious, but which few take the trouble to analyse. No one can fail to be struck by the perception of natural scenery which pervades our Blessed Lord's teaching and life. He draws His illustrations from the landscape where He dwelt; He utters His parables with special regard to the scenes and actions which were before His eyes as He moved through the Holy Land. His teaching can never be fully appreciated without a knowledge of the localities and of the physical character of the region wherein He sojourned. Now the principle of entering into the influence of scenery and its associations affects the life and character of the parish clergyman, and enables him to deal with his people on more equal terms than if he had no appreciation of natural beauties and took no account of the scenes amid which he sojourns. Such feelings at once form a bond of union, unexpressed perhaps, yet real and true, between himself and his flock, and prove, as they are meant to be, a help in inculcating those high lessons and claiming attention for those lofty interests with which he is more intimately concerned. It has been a common reproach against many most estimable parish priests that there is a want of

¹ The volume, we are told, was written before its author's removal to Leeds.

softness in their character, a hard, ungentle manner, which detracts materially from the success of their best efforts. They seem so immeasurably superior to the rough labourer with whom they have to deal, the points of contact are so few, the contrasts so many and startling, that it is but seldom that such men are treated as friends; the burdened heart will not open its grief to them, the soiled conscience seeks not their aid to cleanse it; the sorrow, the doubt, the difficulty, are never brought spontaneously to them for comfort or solution. They are looked upon as masters rather than as fathers. It is not too much to say that one who is susceptible to the influence of country scenery is not very liable to such reproaches. His character is generally more loveable; he wins the esteem and affection of his people, and is obeyed from love by those who are only alienated by severity. Mr. Monro has some beautiful reflections upon scenery and its associations, which, if they appear somewhat over-stretched, have yet their utility in directing attention to the poetical side of pastoral life, and in evoking the sympathies of one class of minds, reminding them that hard workers may find refreshment always within their reach, and that, far from casting off his love of nature when he becomes a priest, a man will do well within certain bounds to encourage and exalt it, as one great aid in ministerial labour.

Closely connected with the above-mentioned principle, which forms indeed one portion of what our author calls parochial genius, is the pictorial power, that is, the power of realising and grasping the associations that surround any special case. You idealise the actual; you group together the various objects that meet your eye as you wend your way to the bedside of some sufferer, and when you are in his presence; and from them you form one whole, of which the prominent figure is the form stretched helpless before you, and the rest are accessories. You grasp these things in your mind as one idea. Everything falls into its proper place, and occupies its proper relation to the principal figure. You see and appreciate every little point in the picture, and invest it with a charm which it possesses not in other eyes. You are affected by it to a degree which *unpictorial* minds would never experience. And the benefit is that you go to your work with a pleasure different and more intense than that of other men. Others may have a keen sense of duty, or a burning love for souls; you have something in addition to these, an interest and a delight superadded to the higher sentiments, a source of refreshment and restoration which is never exhausted, deriving new charm with every change of object and circumstance. This power cannot be created: no study can force it into growth; but its absence may often account for failures, where every effort seems to have been made, and every precaution taken. The same may be said of the kindred power, which Mr. Monro calls the Historical mind. (P. 42.) Every case that comes before

the parish priest has its own history. It is not an isolated fact ; previous events led up to it. A man's present and future are to be judged of by his past. To deal with events without reference to what has gone before is not merely a clumsy handling of delicate matters, but will just make the difference between successful and unsuccessful treatment. The historical mind sees all events in relation to each other. It looks backward to the past and traces its connection with existing circumstances ; it keeps the whole in view, and deals with the case from its knowledge of the entire series of facts. By this means the clergyman not only is more certain to act a father's part in charity and in judgment and in counsel, but his own interest in the work will be greater, his perseverance easier, his love warmer.

Again, Mr. Monro tells us (pp. 46, sqq.) that "the man who successfully grapples with parochial work must have three powers—*conception, facility, and opportunity.*" The last of these signifies merely a sphere in which to labour and means to enable him to carry out his designs. The two former refer to the possession of genius to plan, and ability to execute. These by no means invariably go together. A man may have the head to scheme and arrange, he may be able to see at a glance what is wanted, he may map out his work with the most careful preparation, divide his own time judiciously between prayer, study, schools, visiting ; he may provide for every part of his work, embrace all details in his design, but he may fail in duly carrying out this excellent conception ; he may lack the talent to execute. Perhaps he is easily disheartened, and is tempted to despair altogether when he is defeated in some favourite project, or he likes one portion of his work and not another, he performs part as a task and duty, but with no heart and spirit, he is wanting in eloquence, versatility, concentration of thought, logical power, cheerfulness, elasticity. Some one or more of these faults often render the best laid plans ineffective, or at any rate hinder them from succeeding to the extent expected ; though we must not forget that single-hearted efforts always tell in some way, and that the humble exercise of the best talents we possess will always bring a blessing, if not the very blessing we look for, yet one equally certain and efficacious. Mr. Monro's remarks upon this faculty of planning and designing are a fair specimen of his treatment of the priest's characteristics.

"This power of scheme and conception is difficult of analysis and description. He that has it is conscious of a certain intuitive perception of what is wanted, and what will supply it. He sees suddenly the whole of his subject, like a map laid out before him, or a wide landscape beneath a morning mist. He sees the whole but not perfectly or clearly yet. He gazes at it. He is conscious he has mastered it, he is satisfied, and he feels happy. He walks quickly on ; is absorbed in his

dream and in his vision; cares for no trouble, no anxiety. He grasps the remedy; it meets the case. The sun is breaking out; the mist is absorbing, it is drawing up; each corner of the view is coming into light. He is jealous of losing any of his idea; he searches anxiously into each recess, dreading to lose any essential part. But no, all is light. Light and warmth bathe the scene; the object is gained; the remedy meets the whole case; every portion, as in the landscape, sparkles with sunshine; forms stand out scattered here and there over the scene, everything is clear, distinct, beautiful. No difficulty seems an obstacle; it is hard to spell the word 'despair.' The man who realizes this, anticipates the end before he has put his hand to the beginning, and pleased with the vision of the finished result, he counts all pure pleasure, and those obstacles which many would count final, are to him but as specks in the sun. Human nature comes before him as a great and noble whole; he sees it in its many aspects; his work is to apply the remedy to the disease under which it aches. It is not to him a division of painful labours; schools, services, visiting, sermons, lectures, as if each one were a distinct and difficult task to be *got through* and paid for. But they are all to him but diverse expressions of one whole; manifold colours in one prism; various notes in one beautiful tune. The little ragged boy who laughs happily and freely up into his face; the clean and well-dressed chorister with black belt and open blue eye, are but different expressions of one idea, different figures in one delightful picture. The funeral or the marriage bell, the baptismal company sauntering under the green hedge, the line of village children trooping up to church, are but as threads of one fair garment, which is flung over the form of the material and external world."—Pp. 50, 51.

There is another power second in importance to none, and deficient in which no clergyman can fail to make many fatal mistakes, and that is knowledge of human nature. Our author treats this as a tact or instinct, natural to some and not to others. But surely the natural, intuitive perception of character which some persons (women, for instance, very generally) possess, is not to be compared with that deep and penetrating knowledge which comes from searching self-examination, and the practice of the confessional, and regular study of moral theology. He who trusted to the natural attribute as sufficient to direct him in his intercourse with the members of a parish would either be a very inefficient and dangerous guide of souls, or would simply have no counsel to offer, and no plan of action ready in numberless cases of daily occurrence. Mr. Monro in his present volume gives no advice respecting confession and spiritual direction beyond a suggestion, that a clergyman ought to have a fixed time for "personal spiritual intercourse with his people." Probably the subject will be treated in his papers on Confirmation and First Communion. We can only hope that he will not lead his readers to assume that intuitive knowledge of human nature is of the first importance in this art of arts, forgetting that there are the first principles of this, as of all other sciences, to

be learned, a multitude of positive laws to be studied, metaphysical distinctions, and learned opinions to be embraced in the mind, before the confessor can rightly and fruitfully apply himself to the practice of his art. The last characteristic mentioned is love, the motive-spring of sympathy, the absolute requisite for success, the very power by which CHRIST draws mankind to Himself, and which the shepherds of His flock must possess and cherish, if they would follow their Master's footsteps, and execute their Master's mission.

Of the common faults inconsistent with parochial genius, which are found in clergymen, Mr. Monro names stiffness of manner, magisterialism, condescension, and changeableness. The catalogue is capable of much wider extension, though here we have only space for one or two instances. Take for instance the excessive love of country sports. Without entering at large into the question of the lawfulness of such pastimes, it may be safely said, that wherever the clerical habit would look incongruous, and wherever the pursuit of amusements leads a clergyman into scenes and company ill-befitting a minister at the altar, such sports are imperatively forbidden. But even in things that are lawful many young priests do not observe moderation, using such relaxation, not for health's sake, but making it an ordinary employment, and thus hindering their studies, shortening their prayers, and rendering ministerial functions and duties of second importance. Closely allied with this fault are familiarity and want of dignity, a tendency to sink the priest in the country gentleman or the good fellow, which while it attracts companions, will never draw sinners to the tribunal, or the careless to the altar. A third error is the absence of definiteness in action, that is, the failure to push home an impression once made, rather relying upon one inflexible system to work the desired effect, than taking advantage of every opening, such as excited feelings, softened heart, alarmed conscience, and leaving everything that can be postponed in order to secure the moral victory over even one soul.

In speaking of these common faults in clergymen we are led to notice the true idea of a priestly life, the scheme, the plan on which the exercise of the ministry must depend. Mr. Monro gives his notion of the clergyman's day, which is very much the same as that which he put forth in his former treatise, with the important addition of the suggestion of the catholic hours as the best means to keep alive devotion, and afford a constant supply of good and holy thoughts amid the distractions and dangers of English clerical life.

"Of all arrangements to meet the end, none can be more beautiful than the institution and keeping of the catholic hours. Accustomed as we are, as priests or deacons in the English Church, to have the daily service as the only stated recognition of the keeping of the seasons, it lies open to us to superadd to those services the private or united keeping of the seasons and offices suggested and planned by the wisdom and purity of an earlier age. Here we should find a continual check

upon our words, thoughts, and motives; a check framed in words and acts, which will counteract those of the world. The keeping of these hours was once the exterior life of the Church, her framework and scaffold. Alas for us that it is broken down! Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem have succeeded in ruining our wall, and have hindered the perfection of those battlements and bulwarks on which so much depended. How much we might have been saved from by the continual recurrence of the things of heaven and the study of the cross it is impossible to conceive. But it is our work to repair the breach, and to return to those holy practices which so fulfilled for men of other days the injunction 'to keep yourselves, that that wicked one touch you not.'—Pp. 93, 94.

It has long been a reproach to English clergymen that they lay too much stress on the active, bustling, aggressive life, and make the inner and spiritual life of too little importance. Thus a man is thought to do well, if he says the daily morning and evening service in church, and celebrates the Holy Eucharist on Sundays and Holydays, giving up the whole remaining part of the day which he can spare from domestic concerns to the schools, the sick, and to visiting. Nor can it be denied that time so expended is well laid out. But the question is, might it not have been better spent? Are there no other duties of equal or greater importance which fail to receive their proper attention? Is not the priest neglecting his own sanctification, and trusting too much to human resources, by pursuing the above plan? Certainly private prayer, mental devotion, and meditation, can find small place in such a life. Spiritual reading, moral and doctrinal theology, and Holy Scripture, can meet with scant attention there. And yet, a due regard to these things is absolutely necessary to the character of the *holy* (as distinguished from the *respectable*, or *active*) Priest, and the want of such regard is the reason why England is less fertile in saints than she used to be. Doubtless it may be said that a life of prayer and study befits the cloister, rather than the modern parsonage. But, if it be allowed that such a life is one of higher aims than the secular, that in itself it is more consonant with the best idea of a priest, and that it is by no means absolutely impracticable, why should not the clergy strive to learn this more excellent way, and cease to fancy that, when they have said their offices, taught in their schools, and visited in their parishes, they have done all that is necessary both for themselves and their flock? Mr. Monro tells us, (p. 84,) that "the cloister is out of date, and the idea of gazing on the expression of the Passion antiquated," and yet with singular inconsistency immediately afterwards complains that things in the clergyman's daily life tend too much to take his eye off that Divine Form on the Cross, whereon it ought immovably to be fixed, and proceeds to put forward certain safeguards which may maintain his interest in and recollection of this absorbing and amazing sight. Unhap-

pily it is too true that an altered state of society has rendered the ascetic life more difficult than heretofore. The claims of family, the ties of home, the requirements of position, have a tendency to draw down all to one common type, to lower our high standard, and to make us content with the dead level of English respectability. But the priest ought to rise superior to such demands. Even in the case of a married man it is very possible to live a higher life than is generally seen. Of course the hindrances to entire devotion are strengthened and multiplied by the cares of a household, the calls of wife and children ; but if a clergyman, having fairly examined his position, having searched his own heart, having taken full account of his own special temptations and measured his own power of resistance, feels that he best provides for his own sanctification by marriage, it is of no use at this time to tell him that the married life will render him worldly-minded, will injure his practice, and lower his spiritual nature. There may be deep truth in such assertions ; but while such ties are allowed, arguments like the above will meet with scant acceptance, and deter few indeed from the course which they have determined to take. The practical view is, how can a priest in the nineteenth century be best guarded from falling into careless, worldly ways, from sinking the sacerdotal, in the conjugal and parental life? Prayer, meditation, and study, have already been mentioned as the truest safeguards against those palpable dangers. Another defence is the use of the example of our Blessed SAVIOUR—testing all parochial actions by the Life of CHRIST, by what CHRIST did and said under similar or analogous circumstances.

“We must apply not only the motive of the love of CHRIST, but the Incarnate Form must be brought before our mind ; and the act, which in His ministry resembles the one which we are called to perform, must be our standard ; and how different the case is ! We see the Son of Man walking before us ; we watch Him in imagination in the similar scene of human need ; we study His mode of dealing and compassion, His forbearance, patience, and love, and we say, ‘I will do the same.’ ‘Master, I will follow Thee whithersoever Thou goest!’ We feel He is our point of love ; in eternity He will be the one object of adoration for ever. How glorious to make His example ours, His spirit the rule of our own ! We see Him among the multitudes, insulted, yet meek ; abused, yet patient ; dispirited, yet persevering. There is one sheep out of the flock, and one only, who may be inclined to hear His Voice ; yet He follows up that one, labouring even to the death for *that one*. Such is the spirit of Him Whom we follow, such the acts of Him Whose Form we call up before us, as we proceed to the work of our holy calling. The whole difference consists in whether we go about these acts in deference to a floating principle, or whether our eye is fixed upon the Incarnate JESUS. Again, there is a dispute in the parish. It may be concerned with general principles ; but, as all such things do, it becomes personal ; our feelings become personal also, acrimonious, and sectarian ; our impulse is to repel what we choose to feel to be attacks

or slights upon ourselves. The whole parish acts in the same manner. We are called upon to take a line. Fifty reasons apparently plausible make us think we may stop far short of that entire forgiveness, meekness, and humility, which, as the followers of Jesus, the Gospel would inspire us with. Our mind's eye rests upon the Form of the Incarnation; we hear the Voice of pardon offered to the reviling thief; we see the Face meekly turned to the soldier's blow, the unresisting silence with which He bore the scoff and the charge of sedition and blasphemy; the meekness of manner, which enforced the entireness of forgiveness; and we realise a power derived from the study of those circumstances which we could not have done from a bare abstract principle, however beautiful, attractive, and true. If we studied the doctrine of the Incarnation more, and made it more the rule of our lives, we should act more really on the principles of Christianity. It is not religion barely that we follow, it is Christianity; nor is it Christianity only, it is the Incarnation which is the central idea of our faith, and mainspring of our practice."—Pp. 97—99.

Such are the only defences which can keep a Priest true to his ordination vow, unstained by worldly ways, uninfluenced by low or second motives, and uncorrupted by family cares.

Under the present system, which demands from the parish priest many distinct qualifications, which in other times were more profitably sought in different individuals, the gift of preaching is to modern minds the most important and most rarely found in perfection. Without for a moment allowing the justice of the strictures passed by newspaper critics, whose ignorance is only equalled by their unfairness, we may remark that the wonder would be if really good preachers were more numerous than they are. Sound theology, strong common sense, and practical excellence, may be heard in any pulpit that is not occupied by an evangelical, or one of the offshoots of that body, a free-handler. But Chrysostoms, Bernards and Massillons, are not so easily found. Our preachers are not trained for their important duty from their earliest years. Every man called to the office of the priesthood is of necessity a preacher, and must perform his task whether he acquit himself well or ill. That they do so at all creditably can only be attributed to the excellence of our school and college education, which fits a man for grappling with any difficulty, and enables him to take his part in life whatever that part may be. But the truth is that preaching is a natural gift, and the highest excellence cannot ordinarily be attained except by those whose genius lies in that direction. Still there can be no doubt that for the composition and delivery of written sermons, which shall answer most of the ends of preaching, nothing is wanted that cannot be attained by study, practice, and earnestness. Preaching is a religious duty, and a man ought to prepare himself for its exercise as for any other religious act, by penitence and prayer. "*Mundari enim prius oportet, quam mun-*

dare," says S. Gregory the Great. Everybody knows good Bishop Wilson's prayer before preaching. The following is from an excellent manual in use in the Diocese of Mentz.¹ "DEUS scientiarum Domine, Qui doces hominem scientiam, da nobis sedium Tuarum assistricem Sapientiam, ut nobiscum sit, et nobiscum laboret; effunde super intellectus nostri tenebras radium Tuæ claritatis, quo peccatum et ignorantia, in quibus nati sumus, a nobis repellantur. Tu Qui linguas infantium facis esse disertas, linguam nostram erudias, atque labiis nostris gratiam Tuæ benedictionis infundas. Largire nobis intelligendi acumen, retinendi capacitatem, interpretandi facilitatem, loquendi facundiam copiosam; idque ad nominis Tui gloriam, Ecclesiæ utilitatem, et veritatis defensionem. Domine JESU, lux vera, illuminans omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum, magister noster, doce nos; verba enim vitæ æternæ habes; da nobis intellectum, ut sciamus testimonia Tua. Spiritus Sancte Deus, Qui doces omnem veritatem, dono sapientiæ et scientiæ nos illustra, ut profanas vocum novitates, et stultas sine disciplina quæstiones devitemus; verbis e contra fidei et bonæ doctrinæ, tanquam boni ministri CHRISTI JESU, enutriti, in humilitate et charitate proficientes, quod verum et sanctum est agnoscamus, faciamus, prædicemus; sicque nosmetipsi, cum aliis qui nos audierint, gratia Tua salvi fiamus, per eundem Christum nostrum. Amen."

As to the peculiar studies of the preacher, we may observe that more is required than a certain acquaintance with dogmatic theology, whether obtained from the fathers and schoolmen or from modern compendiums, like that of Mr. Owen. The history of the Church and the lives of Saints and Martyrs afford an inexhaustible source of instruction and illustration, which would give point and force to many an otherwise dull sermon. Let a man note in his reading any striking examples of peculiar virtues, conversions, warnings, deeds of faith, works of mercy, and so on, and he will find them fit into his sermons in an admirable manner, and do more to enchain the attention than the lucidest arguments, or the prettiest flowers, the former of which are seldom followed, the latter simply please, but produce no fruit. Again, let him study not only scientific but therapeutic and mystic theology; let him learn cases of conscience and how to deal with them; let him turn his attention to the best treatises on the spiritual life. Above all, let him have clear and exact views of the truths he enunciates. It is impossible to enforce with any success a point of which one has only a vague conception. Truth must be stated uncompromisingly, but it must also be realised; otherwise, it becomes cant, and is received as such. The dissenter's preaching is effective, as far as it goes, because the modicum of truth and the mass of error which it contains are thoroughly realised. You see by the preacher's eye, and voice, and gestures that he is speaking that which to him

¹ Liber Precum ad usum sacerdotum. Moguntiae, 1852.

is a reality. Few are influenced now-a-days by authority. Logic goes a very little way in moral conduct. Persuasion is much rarer than conviction; yet the former is the sole object of preaching, regarded, that is, as a means of conversion. We are not now treating of sermons addressed to the faithful, but those spoken to the unconverted, or the lapsed, or the irresolute and unstable. If a preacher mean to persuade, he must be real and natural. There may be times when a certain grandeur of diction, even though it be above the usual thought of the generality of hearers, is allowable, as in addresses uttered on the high festivals, when the majesty of the occasion demands suitable words; but for the most part, unless a man speaks "out of the abundance of the heart," simply and naturally, he will make little impression, and reap a scanty harvest.

We commend Mr. Monro's remarks on preaching at the end of his volume to the careful study of our readers. They will find there many of the most prevalent faults in sermons ably corrected, and many valuable hints as to the matter and manner of preaching, which, coming from so experienced a priest, carry with them a very high authority. We shall be very thankful to see the remaining portions of the work.

SOME OF THE SOCIAL AND MORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WEST RIDING.

ONE of our dignified contemporaries, the *Quarterly*, has from time to time treated its readers to essays upon some of the English Counties: in which the subject has been very ably discussed, while all interesting details, whether topographical, historical, social, or legendary, have been industriously drawn together, and artistically disposed so as to impart unity to the whole. It has occurred to us that a valuable contribution might be made to our English ecclesiography by papers of a similar kind written in the interests of the Church. We have heard it proposed at a Rural Deanery meeting that each clergyman in the Union should deposit in the Ruridecanal chest a MS. account of his charge: to which from time to time, as occasion might suggest, additions might be made. By this means not only could each clergyman continue to keep himself well "posted up" in the history and statistics of his charge; but further, each clergyman on entering on his incumbency would know where to refer to for information, and would not find himself thrown upon the tender mercies of the sexton or parish clerk; as

in more than one instance was the fate of the present writer. A new incumbent has to encounter a host of difficulties. He takes up his position aided by a short list of the sick and poor; and it may be a Sunday School report. It is very surprising that more disagreeables do not arise than generally are experienced under these circumstances. There is, besides, a great deal in the "tone" of a place, which a clergyman could readily acquire a knowledge of, at the outset, if put in the way of doing so; but missing this his whole ministry may prove but a succession of blunders, and disheartening failures. The MSS. Parochialia of the Ruridecanal chest might in a few sentences guard the new Incumbent against false steps which under the circumstances are not even errors of judgment; and make him *au-courant* with all the facts of his new charge.

After London with its two millions and a half of souls, there are five dioceses whose respective populations exceed a million. Manchester reckons nearly a million and a half; Winchester exceeds the million by some eighty; Chester by some seventy thousand; Lichfield has twenty-two thousand over the million; and Ripon has thirty-three. But the West Riding is really the most important of these five dioceses, for these reasons, that whereas in the other four population has increased in the usual normal way, the population of the West Riding has exhibited an unprecedented rapidity of growth. In the history of the development of towns, there is perhaps nothing to compare with the development of Bradford, and its prosperity; though unfortunately it is dependent on one trade; whereas Leeds has the three great staple trades of leather, cloth, and iron.

We purpose in the following pages to place before our readers some of the more marked features of the West Riding, as viewed in its social and moral relations.

The inhabitants of the West Riding—like the inhabitants of a great many other districts in England—are a very marked and peculiar class. Many fictionists have attempted to delineate them; but the only portrait which reflects with truth the real features of the race is to be found in the very remarkable work called "Wuthering Heights;" the work of the one genius in a family remarkable for no common intellectual vigour—Miss Emily Bronte, of Haworth. The portraiture in that work is perfect as far as it goes: with singular accuracy, and her sex, her age, her training considered, with a marvellously unnerved finger, she sets before us the mingled shrewdness and superstitiousness, immobility and passionateness, which mark the West Riding type of human nature. Into these dark recesses we have not opportunity now, if we had the courage, to follow this extraordinary Sibyl, of whom we must say in passing, that justice has not been done in public opinion to her unsexly but astonishing gifts. Our observations are very

unpretentious ; they are avowedly superficial, dealing only with external phenomena.

1. And among those external phenomena, the very most striking, the most important, viewed both in the moral and social light, is Tea. This terraqueous globe coheres and performs its functions by the force of gravitation ; and what gravitation is to the whole system, that Tea is to the West Riding. Tea has done more to propagate and establish, than Wesley himself to introduce, Methodism. Tea has now made itself necessary to the Church ; and the clergy are forced to be as enthusiastic in the cause as the dissenters themselves. We have known a clergyman's qualifications summed up by a high eulogium upon his devotion to and skill in managing these uninebriating entertainments. Yet not always uninebriating. There is a cream, popularly known as "Methody cream," which is prized as imparting a peculiarly welcome relish to a Yorkshire tea ; and which is nothing else than rum. It is, of course, unknown to the teaboards of the young. The orgies of the "Theists" prevail chiefly during the Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun-week. Upon those occasions there are three successive entertainments—for the children,—who are franked,—for the parents and friends who for a sixpenny ticket each, will receive as much spiced bread, bread and butter, and buttered buns, and excellent tea, as they desire,—which commonly is a good deal,—and, on the Wednesday night for the tray-holders ; who, in return for their services, are also franked. The actual work of eating and drinking done, the assembly looks to the parson to talk to them. They are almost as gluttonous of this talk as of tea. The speaker is expected to touch upon the state of the Sunday Schools *whose feast* this Whitsun tea-drinking specially is ; and to be as grave and as jocose as he can be. The address over, the young people amuse themselves with playing the very popular game of "thursey" or "twos-and-threes." Until the game is begun, everything is conducted in a peculiarly grave business-like way. The solemnity is indeed little short of depressing sometimes. Even among the young, the exhibition of enjoyment is kept down. They seem wonderfully impressed with a sense of the duties they are met to discharge. In a word, a Sunday School that ventured to dispense with the cementing helps of at least a Whitsun tea-drinking would never witness a return of the season. As a corollary to this general proposition we may add, that the efficiency of a Yorkshire Sunday School, whether in Church or Dissent, is determinable by the frequency of its tea-drinkings.

2. Dr. Johnson prized a man because he was a "clubbable" man. In this respect the learned and social doctor would have been "just the man for" Yorkshire. The West Riding men are very clubbable. And the amount of good done by their clubs, in cherishing prudential habits, and providing for the sick and dead

is beyond all calculation, and all praise. There are "the Funeral Brief," which undertakes to provide for the burial of its members; "the Gardeners;" "the Peaceful Doves;" "the Foresters;" "the Free Gift," which is properly unincorporated: and besides others, there is the most respectable of all, the "Odd Fellows." In some villages you will find always some, and not rarely all of these benefit societies: which for a small weekly payment made during health, undertake to provide for their sick members. As far as our experience goes, these clubs are managed¹ with all that practical, if not pragmatical shrewdness which characterises the West Riding man. But we have, properly speaking, to deal with the man in the club: and not with the club itself. At Whitsuntide, like the schools, or at the season of the village Wake or Feast the clubs have their gala when the parish priest, whether he is, or is not, a member, is generally invited to preach them a sermon, and say grace and carve for them at dinner. In Sunday vesture, and wearing white cotton gloves, the club marches down two and two to church—never, that we have ever heard of, to the dissenting chapels—a silent but not trivial homage to the Church—the brethren having their *little fingers* interlinked, either as a mystic intimation of fraternity, or to secure the regularity and order of the march. But when returned to the dinner-room of the inn, or when assembled there for the Christmas supper, the gravity of the brethren can only be adequately described by stating that it is in proportion to the voraciousness of the guests. All the delicacies of the season, in flesh and fowl, are provided; and truth requires us to state that while we know by actual observation that there is a great deal of hard-drinking in Yorkshire, we fear that there is no less hard-eating. As far as we have learned, intoxication is unknown at these club gatherings. But they eat and drink as if there was a corpse in the room, or as if they were starting for a funeral: and the meal over,

"Like barrels with their bellies full,
They only weigh the heavier."

The club-room is usually a chamber built on to the public house of the village, for the special use of the club. It is ornamented with texts of Scripture, and a board is put up on which are painted the names of deceased members. In one respect these clubs are friendly, in a direct way, to the cause of true religion. Where the clergyman is a member, and makes himself—securing the dignity of his order, of course—social and agreeable to the brethren, there is generally an anxiety expressed that any brother dying shall have the benefit of his ministrations. We have known more than one

¹ An instance has just come under our observation where a member of Odd Fellows whose whole contributions were little over £20, during a long illness received over £30, and £10 besides, paid to his widow, to cover the expenses of the funeral.

instance of this sort. We state the matter for what it is worth. But the clubs, as clubs, are jealous of their own independence, and will not abide any ecclesiastical manipulation whatever. We know a case where a well-meaning incumbent strove to induce them to arrange their annual dinner so as to time it with a harvest home festival, and to no result.

3. The population which we have described as thus given to tea and clubs, and so depressingly grave in the midst of good cheer, and their own most prized enjoyments, possess, as might be expected, no small amount of intellectual activity. The children, especially those of Bradford, exhibit a remarkable acuteness. Reading is the main difficulty throughout the Riding, but writing has proved a mystery which liberal M.P.s have not always been found equal to. This failure in the use of the outward appliances of knowledge seems to impart a more than ordinary keenness to the mind. They possess great aptitude for business. Perhaps in no part of England are there to be found so many men who are self-made. The rapidity with which such men have risen, can only be compared to the affluence to which they attain. They are a truthful race too in their way. They like to be told the facts of the case, even though the facts be their own faults. They are very boastful of their independence, at the same time, and are very likely to turn in their own phrase, stupid, if badgered or treated discourteously. They are as a rule native men; but rarely can the native gentleman be found. What Charles Lamb somewhat profanely calls "God Almighty's gentlemen," is a class but too rarely to be met with. With all this they possess a very grim and bitter humour, and the dialect is favourable to the expression of bitterness. An anonymous writer in Bradford has produced several poems in the Yorkshire language which possess very great merits, and which contain most of the idioms and the peculiarities of West Riding speech.¹ Wit, however, is more prevalent than humour,² a quickness in repartee, more than sense of the ridiculous. "Frolic laughter" that "shakes his ribless sides," is very much a stranger to the West Riding, and this insensibility to fun is not diminished by devotion to tobacco, which is so great in both sexes that nothing less than a mission under the direction of the Dean of Carlisle, and the honorary Canon of Chester can be expected to

¹ The settler in the West Riding must make early acquaintance with some leading forms of speech and pronunciation, such as—*to feckle*, i.e., to settle up; *to side*, to put aside; *to frame*, to set about; *to get-a-gate*, a word of such multitudinous meanings as to furnish matter for a distinct lexicon; *sitheras*, come hither, lass, &c.; *o*, and *ao*, are pronounced *oy*; coals, *coyls*; hole, *hoyl*; school, *schoyl*, &c.

The poems referred to are "T. Spicy Man," "Natterin Nan," "Ta Creekin Gaat," which may be procured from Ab. Holroyd, Bookseller, Bradford.

² The following admirable rejoinder was made by a farming man of our acquaintance to an apostle of teetotalism. The earnest missionary was declaring that as to work, he could do anything *on water*. Our friend replied, "Then you can do more than the Apostle Peter could do."

reform this excess. But the gift most universally shared by the Yorkshire people is the gift of music. We believe that nowhere in the British dominions can so many persons be found possessed of the same endowment in this respect. At the Crystal Palace the amateur singers from the West Riding attracted special attention; and the leading musical conductor has not hesitated to pronounce the Bradford Choral Society the first in the empire. In one village of our acquaintance there have been two or three bands, and some six or seven men capable of playing the organ, and this in a population but little exceeding fifteen hundred. But the general diffusion of musical taste and skill makes all the more perceptible the general inferiority of the church music. The parish church of Leeds is an illustrious exception to the general poverty of style and execution which prevails throughout the diocese. This is in a great measure owing to the insubordinate temper of the choristers, or as a Yorkshireman would call it, their sense of independence. As a general rule it may be accepted that the squabblesomeness of a choir is in inverse proportion to their actual efficiency. This contentious temper of course has its root in what we shall presently come to consider, the local ignorance of the sacramental character of the Church. A Yorkshire chorister sings for the honour and glory of himself. He considers himself of importance as enlarging the congregation. The neighbours will come to hear good singing. However slender their qualifications, a choir if left to itself will attempt anything from an ordinary chant to a full service, under the clearest conviction that their labours will reflect credit on the church and enlarge the congregation. Nothing however in the proper sense of travesty is to be heard in the churches. It is among the dissenters that such irreverent lilt is to be heard as—

And we'll catch a flee-
And we'll catch a flee-
And we'll catch a fleeting joy.

or the even more popular words—

And we'll bow-wow-wow
And we'll bow-wow-wow
And we'll bow-wow-wow before the throne.

If the West Riding Church music is too often miserable, it is rarely, if ever, irreverent or ridiculous.

4. This musical taste, which contributes nothing to choral harmony, in the best sense of the word, contributes as little to domestic habits. The crazy passion for lectures and public amusements is year by year undermining more and more the fireside contentment and habits of the people. One of the most admirable usages of the country is that of the Village Wakes, or annual feasts, when friends and relations assemble together often from a considerable distance. There are of course many great evils

inseparable from these junketings; but the gains are very great. In the first place, the revival of family intercourse and family ties. And then in a sanitary point of view, no little good is attained by the thorough cleansing out to which every house is then subjected. On these occasions the butchers prosper as well as the publicans or showmen. To the success of these reunions, the female part contribute mainly, in the way of baking, roasting, and washing; and decking out the young who on these occasions generally appear with all their Whitsun finery—(Whitsuntide is the great West Riding market for milliners and dressmakers)—re-touched and beautified. We have here started the subject to which we must now devote somewhat of more serious consideration than has hitherto been required. We have spoken up to this time mainly of Yorkshiremen. The West Riding woman has her own specialities. In general laborious, patient, intelligent, tender, and true, she reflects however but too faithfully the human nature of the land. We have dipped into Mr. Mayhew's statistics; and find that up to 1848 Yorkshire, save in the matter of improvident marriages, was below the average of the rest of England as regards illegitimacy, crime, &c. But we believe that if the actual truth could be ascertained, it would be found that in the lowest and lowest but one grade of West Riding life an overwhelming majority of children are born within six months after marriage. From our own experience of the grades specified, and from what we can gather from the experience of others, we are driven to the painful conclusion that rarely if ever do a bride and bridegroom of this rank present themselves at the altar, not disqualified for Christian wedlock. One clergyman's wife reports all the girls of her class successively—enceinte. A clergyman we know complains that at the Whitsun processions through the village—a procession composed of the Sunday scholars and teachers—the procession was headed by a girl, who a few months afterwards was a mother; supported by two other young women who had previously passed through the same ordeal of shame. In a small agricultural parish, with a population in all under four hundred, seven young women, under eighteen years of age, all at the same time carried with them the fruits of their sin. Marriage, it is true, very frequently follows; and in such time as to escape the brand of illegitimacy: but then, if marriage only follows when disguise is no longer possible, who can tell the extent to which the undetected evil may be spread? It may suit very well our energetic contemporary, the *Saturday Review*, to accept this pre-nuptial incontinency as a recognisable institution, but we cannot speak or think of it without horror and dismay. It may be a probable opinion¹ with the casuists that such impurity is venial; but England will never fail to regard as abominable in the uttermost degree, this dark, and we fear we must say, spreading corruption. The intense

¹ Emanuel Sa. Aphor. tit. Debitum Conjugale, 6.

enormity of this state of things is indeed relieved by one fact, that avowed prostitution is very rare; but in our view of the case, this, which to some excellent and philanthropic men ministers much consolation, is really little worth. Nor is this vice found alone in the heated atmosphere of mill life, or among the lodgers in overcrowded habitations; it is no less commonly to be seen in farm life, and among the servants of the gentry. The evil is so prevalent, and so apparently irremediable, that it brings in its own train the evil of a debased and unworthy tone among mothers, it may be, themselves irreproachable. The fault is so common, that it has come to be looked upon only as a failing. We dare to think that the whole subject is one which might well engage the whole of a Bishop's charge, and it is our hearty prayer that it may be soon brought under the notice of Dr. Bickersteth. It is a solemn reflection, that the dioceses of Chester and Manchester, which are now passing through a great tribulation, rank among the worst parts of England for the number of illegitimate births. Is it too much to say—and this as a warning to ourselves—that Israel is smitten down for her sins, by the sword of the children of Ammon.

5. Such a state—such a lamentable state argues, what is itself a lamentable fact, the little hold which the Catholic Church has over the people of the West Riding. Methodism is the established religion of Yorkshire. Its admirable machinery, its easy conditions, make and preserve it popular. It makes all spiritual education superfluous. It gradually sponges out all the Catholic truth learned in the schools of the Church. The sinner's own heart, his subjective frame, are his whole Scriptures. Though the most consistent and spotless and pious Churchman, until he is "brought in," until "he gets freedom," until "he sits on the anxious benches," the man is "still in his sins." A system which thus begins ends with self. Repentance towards God is out of season, and charity to a neighbour is out of place at the death of one, who however polluted his life may have been, even through the first stages of illness, has received the sudden conviction of acceptance; and that interior "lightening," that "bit of glory," which we have so often heard the wretched one gasping and crying out for. In the fanatical excitement of a revival, when as in one instance we know of, the women crawled, in their paroxysms, along the pews of the chapel, there is no sound mind capable of learning, if there be one capable of teaching. And what is one of the most acknowledged truths in connection with these revivals? In the very critical season of that internally-sealed absolution which they dream about, persons will leave the chapel for the act of sin; and all the shame that Burns hints at, or more than hints at, in the end of his "Holy Fair," is again and again re-enacted. A sensuous religionism only worsens what it is by its very nature incapable of spiritualising and exalting.

It is very remarkable, it is a subject well deserving the attention

of the philosopher as well as the Churchman, how this moody but intelligent, this cold but rational and naturally straightforward sample of human nature should be so untrue to its own instincts as to reject the authority and systematic teaching of the Church for the meteor lights of what is mere natural religionism, scarcely disguised in a Christian formalism; and scarcely less puzzling is it to find such ungovernable passions among a class to outward appearance so immovable. But these anomalies are perhaps nearer to a solution than to our feeble powers of analysis they seem to be. They certainly are anomalies which the Scotch people present in even a clearer and bolder light. But out of such granitic material what exquisite capitals, what polished corners for our Temple might be formed, could the Church succeed in enclosing it and bringing it under the refining and creative handling of the Priesthood.

FREEMAN'S PRINCIPLES OF DIVINE SERVICE. II.

The Principles of Divine Service; an Enquiry concerning the true Manner of understanding and using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church. By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A., Vicar of Thorverton, Prebendary of Exeter, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Exeter. Part II. J. H. and J. Parker: Oxford and London. 1862.

CHAPTER II. brings us to what is properly the subject of the work, viz., the Liturgy proper. Connecting the preceding chapter with the present, Mr. Freeman lays down the principle that the Institution of the Eucharist was framed after Jewish household and synagogue rites, and these again based on the sacrificial system. The Holy Eucharist was instituted on the eve of the Passover, and as the weekly Sabbath fell on the day after the Passover, Maundy Thursday would be a double eve; therefore probably, two sets of commemorations would be combined, those of the weekly Sabbath eve, and those of the Passover eve. Both of them, however, had special reference to the same event, viz., the deliverance from Egypt; one the annual memorial, the other the weekly;—we need not stop to prove that, among the Israelites, the Sabbath was far more closely connected with the Exodus, than with the Creation; and the almost certainty that they knew of no day of rest until the Exodus; and that they were informed for the first time of the six days of creation and the seventh of rest, at the giving of the Law. On the eve of the Sabbath, then—Mr. Freeman quotes a modern

Jewish writer,¹—"at supper the master of the family says grace with a *cup of wine* in his right hand, and his left resting on *two loaves of bread*, covered with a napkin;" the two loaves of bread being thus placed on the Sabbath *morning* also. After the supper they sing certain songs of praise. These two loaves, the Jews tell us, are in remembrance of the double portion of manna that was given on the Sabbath eve in the wilderness; but they are also connected with the shew-bread, for the quantity of flour used in making each loaf of the shew-bread was precisely the same as that of manna collected by each man daily, two omers. The book above quoted gives the ritual ceremonies connected with the blessing and eating of these, and the drinking of the wine. Supposing that our LORD took this bread and cup, and blessed and gave them to His disciples, we have the connection between the Eucharist and the "manna that came down from Heaven," of which the shewbread was the memorial after the manna had ceased, together with the deliverance from Egypt; the double type of "CHRIST our Pass-over," both as the Deliverer from sin, and the Bread of Life. We must refer our readers to Mr. Freeman's book for the full ritual, only observing that it has a most singular resemblance to the order, and sometimes the language of the ancient Liturgies—a resemblance more than accidental. The whole action was a solemn taking leave of the old ritual, and a superseding it by that of the new, the Gospel. Another most remarkable fact is that in the Jewish service the Cup of wine was given to *little children*, while the response to the grace was said by an *orphan*; we need scarcely remind our readers that our LORD addresses His disciples by both these terms.

Mr. Freeman next proceeds to draw a parallel between our LORD's action at the Institution, and the action in the ancient Liturgies; first, in the washing of the feet, which "could, consistently with Eastern custom, mean nothing else than such an invitation and admission. The chief mystery which lay hid in it, of their being prepared thereby for the highest mysteries, was hid from them until explained by Himself. By the light of that explanation however, they would perceive that some solemn religious action and service was drawing on. The washing of the priests' feet before entering the sanctuary, and the parallel purification of even lay persons, would occur to them.² Corresponding to this is the washing of hands—and of feet also in some old Eastern liturgies—and the spiritual cleansing by absolution. The next event

¹ "The Book of Religion, Ceremonies, and Prayers of the Jews, as practised in their Synagogues and families on all occasions." Translated from the Hebrew by Gamaliel ben Pedahzur.

² May we not see also a further parallel in Gen. xviii., when Abraham, the founder of Israel, and the father of the faithful, washes the LORD's feet; and the LORD washing the feet of His disciples, the founders of the Church, and the fathers of Christians?

is the scrutiny, "LORD, is it I?" corresponding to examination of conscience and confession; this was followed by the departure of Judas, which was the signal for the commencement of a new action. Our LORD's language now changes, before it had the air of sadness, of pain, as if He was hindered by the presence of one who was "a devil," (διάβολος, adversary, not a possessing devil, δαίμων); now it becomes triumphant in anticipation of His final conquest of the powers of evil. So in the Liturgies comes the bringing-in of the elements, called the "Entrance," with its hymn; in the East the "Hymn of the Only-Begotten;" in the West the "Gloria in Excelsis;" unfortunately removed to the end of the Anglican Office from its proper place at the beginning, where it stood in the first reformed Liturgy—and still more closely connected with the "Entrance" in the Sarum.

After some considerations on the Litany, which, Mr. Freeman holds, is always connected with the Holy Eucharist, there follows the Epistle and Gospel; these, he says, are parallel to the Law and Commandments of the Jewish service above-mentioned, and the latter, the Gospel, in our LORD's words, reiterated once and again, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments." Mr. Freeman is of opinion that the presbyters of those churches to which S. Paul addressed his Epistles, read those Epistles during the celebration.

We shall not follow our author in his attempts to find a parallel with the Creed: they are, as might be expected, anything but successful. With the Oblation we come upon surer ground: this is to be carefully distinguished from the Consecration; the one corresponds to the bringing of the victim to the door of the tabernacle court, which was done by the offerer; the subsequent consecration was the proper priestly act.

"But this general deduction from the entire system would, for the Apostles, be countersigned by the occurrence of an express form of *oblation* in the Passover-eve service, to which our LORD seems designedly to have conformed both His own Eucharistic action and theirs. This, it will be remembered, was a prayer for the acceptance of the evening burnt-offering, and of the service of Israel conveyed therein; and that GOD would make clean their hearts to serve Him. Accordingly, a prayer upon these and kindred topics, called variously 'the presentation,' or 'oblation,' the 'prayer over the offerings,' or of 'the things set apart,' (*secreta*) is found in all Liturgies. None is simpler than the Syriac, 'Alleluia, receive our oblations;' and the revised English, in the Prayer for the whole Church, 'We humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our oblation, which we offer unto Thy Divine Majesty.'"—Pp. 341, 342.

It is perhaps necessary to remind our readers that *secreta* is the participle for *secernere*, to set apart.

"This act of oblation, or rendering up of the Church's gifts, together with prayer for their acceptance, was anciently accompanied by certain

expressive ceremonies, more especially the uncovering of the Elements, and the spreading of the corporal or cloth upon the Altar. The former action was more prominent in the Eastern forms; the latter found its way into the West also, the Mozarabic, the Gallican, the Ambrosian, and finally the Roman: where, however, it occurs earlier, and strange to say, in the very midst of the Creed, at the words, 'and was incarnate.' But this is easily explained. The signification of the spreading of the cloth is, doubtless, that at this point the Church begins distinctly to contemplate CHRIST as the Bread of the world. The feast is now being spread by man for GOD, in the oblation of the gifts of bread and wine, conveying His reasonable service; by GOD for man in the same gifts, as the Body and Blood of CHRIST.

"Accordingly the Church throughout the world says fitly, in this place, her ALLELUIA; the third great hymn, which has come under our notice."—Pp. 342, 343.

Mr. Freeman deplors the loss of this ALLELUIA, and suggests that it should be supplied by a suitable hymn after the sermon; but this would hardly connect it sufficiently with the oblation, and the spreading of the corporal, for the ALLELUIA is part of the hymn, Rev. xix., when it is four times repeated with the ascription of "Salvation and honour" to GOD, because "the LORD GOD omnipotent reigneth; and to her (the Bride) is granted that she should be arrayed in *fine linen* pure and white." The restoration of this would not be difficult, if the choir were to sing these words as an anthem while the elements were placed on the Altar, with the spreading of the corporal and the "fair linen" cloth.

Mr. Freeman goes through the whole action of our LORD at the Institution, and endeavours to point out how it corresponds with the Jewish rites above mentioned, and again, how the liturgies followed both. The idea is certainly well worked out, and, in the main points, undoubtedly the parallel is complete. It is well known to liturgical scholars that there are certain points, we believe eleven, that are common to all the primitive liturgies, but that a considerable variety exists in the order in which these parts appear. It will not be difficult, then, with these various liturgies lying before us, to find out the parallels; but it is equally true that no one liturgy affords one perfectly. The question that arises is, was there ever one primitive liturgy complete in all its parts? and if so, how do we account for the variation? That there was a liturgy or liturgies in the Apostles' time, is proved from the fact, that the Apostles quoted them in the Epistles,¹ the difficulty that presents itself is the variation. Did the Apostles use one liturgy, or did they, according to the tradition of various Churches, each form their own, and leave them as legacies to the Churches over which they presided?

¹ See an article in the Christian Remembrancer, Vol. XXXIX. p. 479 et seq., generally attributed to Mr. Neale, in which these quotations are examined and compared with the liturgies.

"The true theory, in fact, of the origination of liturgies would seem to be, that there were many more *centres of primary liturgy* than has been commonly supposed. The early Apostolic history would of itself lead us to this conclusion. It may be perfectly true that, as ecclesiastical tradition reports, the Apostles confined their personal ministrations for about twelve years to the Holy Land. And this at first sight seems to involve the further conclusion, that the Church during that period had one unvarying form of liturgy: that, namely, which the Apostles used, and that this was the parent of all others. But had this been so, had the mode of celebration stiffened into one form, and that, too, stamped with exclusive Apostolic mintage, it is simply inconceivable that the subsequent varieties of the liturgy could have arisen, and the truth is, that the slightest reflection on the events of the day of Pentecost must convince us, that neither the Church nor the liturgies were restrained during all that time within such narrow limits."—Pp. 382, 383.

Mr. Freeman thinks that Jews, converted at the Day of Pentecost, must have carried away with them back to the countries they came from, what was essential to preserving the Church's life, a Priesthood, a Baptismal Office, and a Liturgy; otherwise, for twelve years, i.e. so long at least, as the Apostles continued in Judæa, they must have been without the means of preserving spiritual life, and of imparting it to others. For instance, when S. Paul addressed the Romans there was evidently a Church in that city, and as far as we can see, no Apostle visited it till S. Paul did in A.D. 62. Would that Church have been without a Eucharist all that time? The thing is impossible. What the converts—some of them, doubtless, ordained priests—took with them at their conversion, was a very rudimentary form; perhaps consisting only of that essential to the sacrifice and consecration, other parts were added at subsequent times, accounting for the variations in order. Thus, on the arrival of the Apostle, he would find a regular liturgy in constant use, and, having all essentials, would leave its order untouched, only making such additions to it, as rendered it perfect. Again, another cause came in, which naturally made differences in different Churches, according to different customs, viz., the *disciplina arcani*: the effect of this would be the removal from the earlier part of the Office, all clear enunciations of the higher Christian doctrines, in order that the generality, and those preparing for Baptism, might attend the first portion, while the latter was only for the *fideles*. Thus—

"The LORD's Prayer has disappeared altogether from the beginning of the rite, and does not occur until just before reception. The elements are not brought in until after the reading of the Gospel, and the dismissal of the catechumens; the 'great entrance' (in technical language) preceded the 'little entrance.' The Roman rite, though the elements are brought in at the beginning, has lost its initial LORD's Prayer."—P. 387.

A curious fact is the result of this change.

"The Greek S. James, in its very first prayer, recognises the *presence* of the elements on the altar, in the words, 'This Thy sacred and spiritual Table, on which Thy SON CHRIST is, in a mystery, set forth for sacrifice.' But the Armenian, again, to the great bewilderment of the ritualist, has, 'The holy Body and Blood of our LORD are before us,' when, according to the present text, the elements are not as yet brought in. So carelessly had this rite adopted the Cæsarean reforms of S. Gregory. In S. Chrysostom's, again, such lofty language is used just before the entrance of the *Gospels* as to awaken a suspicion that it originally applied to the more solemn event of the entrance of the elements."—P. 388.

This change in the order of the Liturgies cannot, Mr. Freeman thinks, be earlier than the second century, because then commenced the system of reticence, which did not exist in the times of S. Irenæus and S. Justin; both of whom published unreservedly a description of the mysteries. Another change in later times Mr. Freeman supposes to have taken place, viz. the position of the Invocation in the Oriental Liturgies.

"Nor do I hesitate further to affirm, after the fullest consideration, that the Eastern Liturgies have gone yet greater lengths in inverting the original order and placing after the consecration words and prayers belonging to the oblation."—P. 394.

Mr. Neale has come to the exactly contrary conclusion, viz., that the Oriental form is the original, that the Roman once had the Invocation, but has now lost it. This is not the only instance where Mr. Freeman's extreme loyalty to the English Church has led him into error, and blinded his eyes to the manifest defects in the Anglican office. He does, however, confess that the "Gloria in Excelsis" is in the wrong place.

On the origin of the Anglican Liturgy we read :—

"One of the most interesting results of modern ritual inquiry, especially for the English Church, is the discovery of what has been called the 'Ephesine Liturgy.' This rite, originally used in the exarchate of Ephesus, (and, doubtless, though no trace of it has been discovered, elsewhere also,) died out, after a while, in its native eastern soil, being finally superseded in the fourth century by the rite of Constantinople, but not before it had planted out vigorous offshoots,—or was represented however, by kindred offices,—in Gaul, and Spain, and other regions of the further West."—P. 399.

It is from this Liturgy, introduced by S. Augustine from Arles, that our English Office comes; S. Augustine himself having been consecrated by Gallic Bishops. Its principal features, as seen in the Gallic and Spanish forms, were its boundless variableness.

The Eastern rites are unvarying, with occasional interpolations on great festivals; and that of Rome, perhaps, no variables at all; this one is ever changing. Retaining the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Ter Sanctus, and the Words of Institution without change, we find the prefaces, the prayers, the benedictions were never the same on any two days of the year. Another remarkable feature—not remarked, Mr. Freeman says, by any previous writer—is that in this Liturgy alone, including those derived from it, the Spanish, Gallican, and Anglican, the rubrics are conceived in the imperative mood; all others, East and West, being in the indicative.

On these two peculiarities Mr. Freeman bases a theory, that the Ephesine Liturgy, and consequently the Anglican, bears internal evidence that S. Paul was, if not the author of this Liturgy, at least so far connected with it as to leave his peculiar stamp upon it.

“Nor are we without strong presumptive proof derived from his own writings, that it was indeed he who originated, and exclusively employed a *variable* method of eucharistic celebration. In a well-known passage, which the best writers have agreed to interpret ritually, he says, ‘when thou shalt bless,’ eucharistically, ‘with the spirit,’ i.e., in a rapture, and in an unknown tongue, ‘how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say the accustomed Amen (τὸ ἀμὴν) to the giving of thanks,’ or eucharistic blessing, ‘seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou indeed givest the eucharistic blessing well, but the other is not edified.’ Now the state of things here implied—that is an eucharistic office in a condition of flux and *ad libitum* variety as to its prayer of consecration—is one which the existing phenomena of all other offices in East or West, not only give no hint of, but forbid us to suppose can ever have had place in those rites. . . . The Spanish and French Offices, on the other hand, agree in having exactly such a varying consecration prayer, as S. Paul seems to refer to. It is further remarkable, that the one rite in the world which, on the whole, delivers, with slightest variation, S. Paul’s form for the words of institution, is no other than the Spanish. The Gallican is unknown to us. And may we not remark, as regards the rubrical peculiarity of these rites, that S. Paul continually gives directions, which may have led to the *imperative* form in the rite delivered by him?”—Pp. 402, 403.

We have given enough to show the great value of this work, and how much information on hitherto inaccessible subjects is afforded us. It may seem almost ungracious, but we feel it to be a duty, to point out some of the great faults which disfigure the book. We shall try and do so without displaying a captious spirit. First, then, Mr. Freeman has not modified his opinion, expressed in the “Introduction,” published five years ago, which called down at the time so much animadversion, viz. that it is the dead body of CHRIST, and not the living, that is present; an opinion, we believe, held only by the author. The next is the

denial of Eucharistic adoration. Mr. Freeman chooses to put this proposition in such a singular form, that we carry away with us the impression that either he intended to draw our eyes from the proper point in the question, or that he really does not understand the question himself. We give his own words:—

“Another remark is, that among the results of this investigation, we cannot reckon the faintest trace or intimation of any worship to be paid *to a sacrifice*. This is indisputable. The worship is throughout presented *by means* of the sacrifice, not directed to it. There is no countenance, then, from this quarter at least, for the mediæval opinion, lately re-introduced by some earnest minds amongst us, that the supreme purpose, or, however, a very principal one, of the Eucharist, is to provide, in the ordained media of the rite,—the consecrated elements,—an object of Divine worship.”

As if any one could imagine for a moment that because we worship the antitype, therefore we should expect to see the Jews worshipping the type!! or because the Jews did not worship the type, Christians are not to worship the antitype!! It is true, he afterwards says:—

“But it will perhaps be contended that this is among the number of the things in which the old system could not justly mirror forth the new; arising, as it does, out of the Divine Nature of the Gospel Sacrifice and Priest. But to this there is the fatal objection that S. Paul, when setting forth to the Hebrews the points in which the Gospel sacrificial system transcends that of the Law, makes no mention of this as one.”—P. 279.

Neither does he say that it is not, nor should we expect it; for he is speaking primarily of the Sacrifice of CHRIST, the bloody offering once made. Mr. Freeman is, however, consistent, for he believes in a *dead* Presence, and not a *living* one; but still in another point of view he is inconsistent with himself, since he shows that the sacrifice was considered complete *before* the animal was put to death; that the “*immolatio*” and “*mactatio*,” the essence of the sacrifice, were made on the *living* animal. The type, therefore, was a “*living sacrifice*,” not a dead one. Again: Mr. Freeman seems to deprecate a daily sacrifice. He would reserve the Eucharist for Sundays and holy days, yet he makes the *continual* burnt-offering of the Hebrew ritual a type of the Eucharist!! Again: he speaks against non-communicating attendance, yet many of the types he produces strongly favour the practice. Is Mr. Freeman prepared to say that all those who assisted at a sacrifice, partook of it? If not, does he deny that they did receive any benefit from the sacrifice? We pointed out in a former paper (Vol. xxiv. p. 544,) that Mr. Freeman unaccountably ignores one benefit from the sacrifice, viz. pardon of sin, and that this error has led him into the further one just mentioned.

We can say sincerely, in conclusion, that having carefully studied this work, we are only the more convinced of the orthodoxy of those practices which are daily commending themselves to devout minds—nay, which seem to arise spontaneously with the revival of spiritual religion, and which had only been dropped in colder and more formal times; and that the very principles of this book, if properly considered, confirm our belief in their value and necessity. With these cautions to our readers, we can most heartily thank Mr. Freeman for having led us into, what is to many, new ground, and opened out new sources of information on this great mystery.

S. FRANCIS XAVIER.

Christian Missions. By T. W. MARSHALL. Vol. I. Burns and Lambert. H. Goemare, Brussels. 1862.

Missionary Life of Xavier. By H. VENN. Longman. 1862.

AMID the convulsions of Europe, the little kingdom of Portugal has, with singular firmness and success, maintained its importance and integrity. Although deprived, like the adjoining kingdom, of its colonial empire, it has never experienced the same decline, nor uncomplainingly settled down into the same obscurity and insignificance. The ardent politician may account for this by pointing to the loyal friendship which, since the days of the House of Stuart, has existed between Portugal and Britain. With more piety and with more reason, the devout Christian will look upon the least among the kingdoms of the land, this Bethlehem of the nations as possessing still unforfeited, the blessing of the ALMIGHTY, consequent upon the great and noble efforts of the Lusitanian King,¹ in the middle of the sixteenth century, to spread among the heathens of Asia, the glad tidings of Redemption. Whatever may be the present advantages of a visible centre of unity, it is worthy of note, that the last great attempt, if not the last really great work undertaken within the limits of the Roman obedience, owed neither its conception, origination, nor execution, to the Pope, who daunted by the political disturbances of the time,² rather retarded when his blessing was sought, than promoted the designs of Loyola and his

¹ John III. reigned from 1523 to 1580. After his death, Portugal was annexed for 60 years to the crown of Spain; John reluctantly foregoing his desire to marry his beautiful step-mother, Leonora, took to wife Catherine, the youngest sister of the Emperor, Charles V.

² There was war at the time between the Turks and Christians. The Holy Land was the original destination of the Missionary Brethren. King John, by means of the Portuguese Embassy at Rome, procured the Pope's approval of the Indian Mission.

brethren. Had Portugal, on the death of John, been finally absorbed into the Spanish kingdom, and its place blotted for ever out of the roll of nations, it would nevertheless have left behind it a name of imperishable spiritual renown. The solemn trusts, from which the Divine Will has deposed Portugal, have been temporarily consigned to England. May she awaken, ere it be too late, to a sense of her responsibilities; and seeing, in the bloody chastisement of the late Indian mutiny, a merciful appeal from God, may she study to imitate the zeal of her into whose possessions she has entered. If King John's success, looked at from the human point of view, may be fairly attributed in the first place to his employing a fraternity of earnest men, specially incorporated for the purpose of evangelizing the heathen; and in the second place, to his employing all the influence of his high office, to promote the great cause they and he had undertaken, surely materials are to be found within the Church of England for the formation of a brotherhood inspired by views equally high, and guided by rules suitable for this special work, even if they cannot hope for support from the state. The society, which did so much at the end of the sixteenth century, commenced with three members only. Is it beyond hope, that such a fraternity may spring up amongst ourselves? Must we wait for the importunities of a semi-laic society, and of the Home Episcopate, before labourers can be found to labour in the vineyard of the LORD of Hosts?

But we must not allow ourselves to be hurried away by the interest, the most painful interest attaching to this general question. A special portion of the subject claims our attention. We have prefixed to this paper the titles of two works, but we must confess that we are unable to determine from the works themselves, which is the prior in point of time. From internal evidence, we might conclude that they issued contemporaneously from the press; and that neither author was acquainted with the other's work. We cannot imagine that Mr. Marshall, who brings to the rack of the severest critical torture, and with the same uniform judicial solemnity, the most important and the most immaterial statements, would have left unscathed the timid venture of the Church Missionary Society's Honorary Secretary. On the other side, Mr. Venn might justly be regarded by all the Evangelical world, as having betrayed his trust, if knowing that such a champion as Mr. Marshall was in the lists, he shrank from breaking a lance with him, and doing battle in behalf of that "*Protestant Truth*" which, whatever it strictly imports, seems to be all the truth Mr. Venn seems to know—of which he professes to be the advocate. But if it be a fact, as we believe it is stated—but which our tender regard for Mr. Venn's character for chivalry, still induces us to question, that Mr. Marshall's pages were actually before the English public, many months before Mr. Venn's came

forth from Longman's, we fear we must own with confusion, that Mr. Venn has shown, not one, but a whole plume of white feathers.

To be sure, Mr. Marshall is a writer one would not like needlessly to come into collision with. Our first impressions of his book were, that his quotations—like those of Mr. Ryle, which go to prove Jackson for instance, a Calvinist and Puritan—partake in no small degree, of the fallacy of quotations; and that his style, maintained at a white heat of indignation against the English Church, is of that incisive yet querulous character, which one is familiar with in neophytes who endeavour to forget in their denunciation of others, the unsatisfactoriness and unsoundness of their own position. Subsequent information authenticates this impression. We regard the work, however—we desire thus to preface the strictures we feel called to make on it in detail—as a very useful and valuable publication. We know no penitential work more likely to be effectual in bringing English Churchmen to their senses, and making them know, and own, and bewail the appalling shortcomings of the Church in the matter of Missions to the Heathen. Praise be to God, thus much of the fire of grace has yet been left in us, that we do not shrink from the catalogue of our misdeeds, nor seek to hide them from ourselves nor from our LORD; nor shall we captiously take exception to the Author's manner in dealing with this part of his subject and with our own failures—although it is shrewish and vixenish enough: with the question of the Missions of the sects we have nothing to do; we say this, quite independently of Mr. Marshall's quotations, whether in every instance verifiable or not.

But not only have Mr. Marshall's affections been ultramontanised, his wits also have in a measure gone "over the hills and far away," so that the spelling of his book is not only very faulty, but occasionally he has forgotten the obedience due to his mother tongue, and the proprieties of English grammar,¹ and the logic is often even more exceptionable. A writer, less of a partisan, would have seen in the prodigious expenditure of England on Missions which are proved to be, and are known to be so unfruitful, a generous, though a blundering devotion to a right principle and duty. It is a great and memorable fact, that a Roman monk can pursue his missionary work on a stipend of £20 a year; while an English Clergyman, with his national predilection in favour of soap, and his belief in his right "to lead about a sister, a wife," requires some hundreds. Cannot Mr. Marshall see in what a poor light he places the zeal of the "Catholic world," when he states that the funds raised among all the nations of the earth are so miserably small, that they can only furnish so small a stipend to the Missionaries from Europe; and that the number of those Missionaries is ludicrously small.

¹ Vide p. 406. Is Mr. Marshall indeed one of our Inspectors of Education?

Again, it is quite an inadequate statement to say, that all Mr. Marshall's "geese are swans;" all his ducklings are albatrosses. The homage which our author does to every statement on his own side, is wholly uncritical and unmeasured. He ever and anon reminds us of an amusing picture, which a lady, a native of Madeira, once gave us of her good Bishop's discomfort and embarrassment, occasioned by the genuflections and prostrations of recently romanized Englishwomen. With a like excess of veneration does Mr. Marshall do obeisance to every statement of his authorities; and all is fish that comes to his net. Among the hundreds and thousands, and hundred thousands of Christians, teachers, and converts, in the midst of the most trying tortures, rarely is even a "solitary apostate" recognized. The unity of faith is fully represented in the unvarying fidelity under martyrdom; except the renegade and double-dipped Capuchin, Father Norbert, all are found faithful to the truth and loyal to the Church. Now little as Mr. Marshall credits us, little perhaps as he will regard us as being capable of even so much faith, we will assure him that we believe that some of the most illustrious martyrs of the Church, have been trained in the Roman obedience; and that in a very great number of cases, the Missionaries and converts of the Jesuits, adorned by their lives, and illustrated by their constancy even unto death, the doctrine of God our SAVIOUR. Many of them were animated and sustained by Grace; which Mr. Marshall somewhat needlessly again and again reminds us was supernatural. Such of course is the life, as it is a hidden life, of every Christian. But if we are to believe all that Mr. Marshall believes, and to judge of spiritual work as he judges of it—he of all men cannot complain of the sceptical inquiry, "Where are the results?" We will urge this here now on the general question, and we will resume it afterwards in considering details. With a smaller force, and in our author's view, no greater spiritual impulses, the Apostolic company overran and vanquished the world in parts of Asia, in Africa, and Europe. They laboured in the face of opposition from within as well as the opposition from the world without. And yet the Jesuit Missionaries, according to the reports which Mr. Marshall accepts, made more converts and wrought more miracles, than are recorded in Holy Scripture; and yet India and China are unconverted; and not the judgment of God, but the persecuting sword of the heathen, has swept away Christianity from Japan; and, a fact unexampled in the history of the faith, if we are to believe Mr. Marshall, not heresy, not a corrupted Christianity, but a pagan infidelity, has triumphed over the Cross of CHRIST. It is incumbent on Mr. Marshall to explain how it is, that the Church he advocates, having triumphed as he says it triumphed, should have so miserably stopped short in its career of victory. Having done such wonders in the times of the founders of these Missions, why has it added nothing since to the

area of their spiritual successes? It is unreasonable to say that the presence of the sects accounts for this failure. The Apostolic Church, in the primitiveness of its undeveloped doctrines and powers, withstood and confounded the thousand errors, and the manifold transformations of Gnosticism. Mr. Marshall unconsciously pays a greater tribute to Protestantism, than he will on reflection be pleased to own. Crediting, as ex-Anglican Romanists do almost invariably, more than native Roman Catholics think themselves called upon to credit, Mr. Marshall betrays himself into the confession, that the Church of Rome, against which the gates of Hell cannot prevail, has been prevailed against, and obstructed by the powers of Protestantism. Is this indeed the destiny of the Truth? is this all we are taught by the marvellous history of S. Athanasius?

We must take leave to say, we think Mr. Marshall professes too much for his own ends. Mr. Puff's style was so inimitably fine, we are told, that he had as much to say for a Ribbon as a Raphael. So with Mr. Marshall; all the actors in his drama move about in the same rosy light; always excepting Father Norbert,¹ and the "solitary Apostate," not a failure in method, not an error in judgment, not a departure from principle is reported from all the records of the "Catholic Missions." On the other hand, having looked on this picture, let us turn to the history of "the Sects." Here are indeed failures in method, errors in judgment, departures from principle; and nothing else whatever! with them, all things in every respect, and every thing in all respects, bad; very bad; irremediably bad. Now, we have already stated, in what good part we take Mr. Marshall's compilation, for herein he is not a discoverer, but simply a compiler, of our own self-exposures, of our own miserable discoveries of our misdeeds and mistakes. It never strikes Mr. Marshall, what great virtue is shown by this self-condemnation; it never seems to occur to him, that England as in the exposure of her own commissariat, and of the defects during the Crimean war, so in the exposure of the defects of her own Church, displays a magnanimity that is by no means common, or even natural. While our Author writes in *necessary ignorance* of the whole case for which he constitutes himself special pleader, for Roman Catholic Missionaries, *Xavier* excepted, as a rule exhibit a reserve and caution in their home correspondence, which we wish our own would in some respects imitate; he has the whole case stated for him against the Church, either by the Missionaries themselves, or the voluntary tourist, or the travelling statesman, or the leisure-taking soldier. All this breeds no scruple, no admiration in Mr. Marshall's mind. He is not the man to hesitate about a sharp, vigorous, condemnation of England and its belong-

¹ He was by no means the first to complain of the disobedience of the Jesuits to the Pope. See Ranke, App. 150.

ings. So far we have, for his own sake mainly, regretted that Mr. Marshall, with some other furniture, forgot to bring his logic with him, when he left the Church. But we have to struggle with a somewhat stronger feeling than regret, when we observe with what industry he labours to confound the English government, and the English Church in India. We could indeed from our own knowledge paint even a darker picture than even he attempts, we will say, of the fearful guilt of the English Government in obstructing the Gospel of CHRIST; but to make the English Church responsible for this, in the way he would make it responsible, betrays something more than a logical unsoundness, and a forgetfulness of the actual relations of the court of Rome with the governments of Europe. We have stated that Mr. Marshall writes in some measure in necessary ignorance of the whole case he advocates; occasionally he is betrayed into something like a voluntary ignorance. As might be supposed, he very fairly takes the Jesuits under his special protection; and he touches with a curiously gentle touch, the subject of the suppression of that order. Mr. Marshall seems to be unaware that the universal abhorrence which all the European governments, and all in the Roman obedience, rightly or wrongly, had conceived against the Jesuits, had forced the amiable and pious Clement XIII., who was devoted to the order, and himself only ambitious of canonization, to convene a consistory to take into consideration the suppression of the Brotherhood. What Mr. Marshall is pleased to call¹ the "unwilling decree extorted by violence," and "conceded by regret," was the result of the labours of a conclave of Cardinals, appointed to investigate the archives of the Propaganda.² And what does Clement XIV. himself, in his bull of suppression say, to justify Mr. Marshall in calling this an "unwilling decree;" the fact being, that this Pope, having belonged himself to the Franciscans, was very well disposed to give the company the *coup de grace*? Guided by the evidence furnished by the Committee of Cardinals, the Pope having declared the suppression of the order, to be "necessary, in order to prevent Christians from rising one against another, and from massacring each other in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church," and having added, "that it was very difficult, not to say impossible, that the Church should recover a firm and durable peace, so long as the said society subsisted," proceeds to say, "*inspired by the Divine Spirit*, as we trust, urged by the duty of restoring concord to the Church, convinced that the Society of JESUS can no longer effect those purposes for which it was founded, and moved by other motives of prudence and wise government, which we keep locked in our own breast, we abolish and annul the Society of JESUS, its offices, power, institutions, &c." The Bull

¹ P. 150.² Ranke, p. 327.

bears date, July 21, 1778.¹ Shielded by the so solemn decision of so illustrious a Pontiff, we shall dare to differ from Mr. Marshall in his indiscriminating admiration of the Society; and to express our regret that he should presume to charge the Bishop of Rome with contemptible weakness, precipitate and tyrannical injustice; and with placing the Divine endowment of his infallibility, at the disposal of the mere powers of the world. Anyhow, we have something more than the doctrine of probability to support us in regarding with severe distrust, the company itself, and its reports of its own members. If at the outset the peculiar errors of the Jesuit system were less developed; if, as we believe, in the case of Xavier, the distinctive mischiefs of the body were not yet displayed, we cannot forget that even in the lifetime of the founder, the company was condemned in 1554, for teaching "*ils peuvent pecher, sans pecher*," by the faculty of Theology at Paris.² We allege all this, simply because of its pertinency to the point which we are just now coming to. If in the judgment of one generation at least of the Catholic world, speaking by its professed Infallible Ruler, the misdoings of the Company were so great that it was superseded all over the world, and even its Bishops dismissed from the East, the whole testimony to the miracles of Xavier, becomes more than suspicious. Now we are not of them who think that miracles have ceased to appear because they have ceased to be needed; to some extent such a solution of the difficulty may answer in lands which witness an established presence of the Church, which constitutes, rightly viewed, a very special and affecting miracle. But in regions circumstanced as China and Japan, we can only account for the cessation of miracles, by referring to that general decay of the Church's faculties, and that ebbing of its inspired powers, which mark the decadence of the Church—as every reflecting Christian will own—in its mediæval and modern epochs. We are as far as possible therefore from questioning the possibility of Xavier's

¹ More than a century before the Society was censured by Innocent X.

² The words of S. Pasquier, Attorney-General, when prosecuting the Company in the Parliament of Paris, 1564, two years before the death of Loyola. Mr. Marshall takes just pride in pointing out the care taken of the Scriptures—as to translating and distributing them—by the Jesuit Brothers. Unfortunately, the Company has made it a *probable* opinion, and therefore a safe opinion to hold, that it is not necessary to believe that there are any Scriptures; that it had perhaps been better if there never had been any Scriptures; that it is not necessary to believe that every word has been inspired by the HOLY SPIRIT; that each several truth and doctrine should be immediately communicated to the writer by the HOLY SPIRIT. These opinions of Bellarmine, Hosius, Less, and Hamel, we commend to the notice of Dr. Temple and his co-ideologists. On another point we owe an acknowledgment to Mr. Marshall; he does not put into the mouth of any one of the illustrious Martyrs, whose deaths he describes, a single expression at variance with the Catholic faith. Angels, and Saints, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, are left unmentioned; only in the case of Xavier himself, does he depart from this reserve. The last words of S. Francis were, according to Mr. Marshall, "*Monstra te esse matrem*." What authority he has for such a statement we know not. Without a companion to catch his last words, or a priest to minister the last offices, Xavier breathed his last.

having performed those ten miracles, on the ground of which, besides his having the gift of Tongues and Prophecy, Gregory XV., seventy years after Xavier's death, pronounced his canonization. One of these miracles, that of the sea crab, was rather the miracle of the crustaceous creature, than of the Saint. We feel fully justified in discrediting altogether those after wonders, which surviving admiration has been at the pains, since the act of canonization, to accumulate, or create, to the honour of the great missionary. But we do not hesitate to affirm that these prodigies, on which the act of canonization was founded, rest upon evidence which the infallible chair itself, by its subsequent condemnation of the order, justifies us in doubting. The evidence was collected by members of the Company. Of course the Pontiff, and those who drew up the brief, believed the statements made, and the evidence may have been collected in great, or as we believe, it was in too much faith. But there is no rule which Mr. Marshall more justly or repeatedly urges in his book, than that of not deciding upon the testimony of parties interested themselves; though nothing, we fear, would induce us to believe—we are bold to say, we do not believe that Mr. Marshall himself believes—the incident of the lobster and the crucifix. But we have Xavier's own letters to convince us, that he had not the gift of tongues; for he employed Anthony as his interpreter.¹ We have his own letters—the sole quarry out of which have been drawn all the materials for all the lives written of him, containing frequent statements wholly incompatible² with the idea of his being a Thaumaturgus. We have the most credible of all his admirers speaking in much the same tone. Brandonius, who communicated the Saint's decease to the Jesuit College at Coimbra, and Nunez Rector of the Goa College. Both these men were versed in Indian life, and thoroughly experienced in Missionary work. And yet, writing fourteen years after Xavier's death, the latter uses such cold language as this: "Many persist in the affirmation, that Xavier raised a dead person to life at Cape Comorin;" while the former dismisses the subject in these words:³ "He persevered in

¹ "Here I am," he says, after he had been well nigh two years in India, "almost alone—in the midst of a people of an unknown tongue, without the assistance of any interpreter [Anthony being sick]. Roderick, indeed, who is here, acts in the place of Anthony. Conceive therefore, what kind of life I live in this place; what kind of sermons I am able to address to the assemblies, when they, who should repeat my addresses to the people, do not understand me, nor I them. I ought to be an adept in dumb show," &c. (I. 32, Fr. 32. Quoted by Venn. P. 37.)

² One kind indeed of miracle Xavier frequently lays claim to, and by so doing, really disclaims the miracles, properly so called, with which he is credited; we mean miracles of grace, as in the answers to prayer, and the operation of the Sacraments. The administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, is undoubtedly a dispossessing of Satan, and quodam sensu, may be regarded as equivalent to casting out devils.

³ Quoted by Venn, 92. The other two hearsay miracles are that Xavier restored a blind man to sight in Japan, and showed a knowledge of the secret thoughts of a person whom he had himself to dismiss from his service for lying and stealing. We have far higher evidence for a miraculous cure performed, through baptism, by a Mormon elder, in London, on a young woman pronounced incurable of spine disease.

his course from first to last, with such energy of mind, and such alacrity, that the men of this present day will hardly believe the things told of him, as they seem to exceed human strength !” We will not further pursue the subject ; we are satisfied with the depositions of those who had the very best opportunities of knowing the whole state of the case. No after testimony can overbear the evidence of Xavier himself, corroborated as we find it in substance, by his few personal friends.

But we must part from a work which is really very entertaining ; in doing so, however, we would make one or two observations. Xavier was supported throughout his whole career by the power of Portugal, very much then what England is now. If it seems to impair the dignity of Missionary devotion now, for Clergymen to act under the protection of their own government, Xavier must fare in the same way. If it is a misuse of Missionary opportunity to engage in traffic, and to promote political interests, in which two respects English Missionaries have, it may be, often transgressed, we must not forget in the contrast that is forced upon us, that Xavier never failed to promote, when he could, the interests of Portugal. Justice requires us to add, he never trafficked in tobacco for his own gains, or in those plans ever had a thought for any thing but the promotion of the faith. Nor does Xavier give a more agreeable picture of Indian life among the European civilians than is quoted by Mr. Marshall, from the accounts of English life in Hindustan, and its appalling enormities. Mr. Marshall very properly insists, on the truth, that the blood of Martyrs is the seed of the Church. Now he is as anxious as Mr. Lowe himself, for a judgment by results ; and we ask, what are the results of those frequent and remarkable Martyrdoms which crowd his pages ? The impartial observer finds the vigorous assertion of the Christian life at one or two Ecclesiastical centres ; but as Mr. Marshall’s own book testifies, the nations remain unconverted. Heretical Missionaries before now have shed their blood for the cause they adopted ; and their testimony has proved unfruitful, because not based wholly upon the Catholic faith. Martyrdom, we hold, only then fails of its proper effects, when not undergone in Christian lowliness, for the pure, un mutilated, and legitimate Truth.

Mr. Marshall, although not yet himself canonized, but accepting the somewhat questionable maxim, “none but a Saint can write the life of a Saint,” inconsistently enough furnishes a sketch of that of Xavier. Of course he endorses all that has been told of the baptisms celebrated by the Saint, 10,000 in a month, at Travancore.¹ Now allowing only six hours a day for food, sleep, preaching, teaching, and private devotion, there would leave about two minutes for each baptism ; but we will not dispute the point. Had it been our task to write the life of so eminent a servant of CHRIST, we would rather have shunned the subject altogether, or

¹ Yet Xavier himself only says, “ quos nuper baptizavi plurimos.”

striven to prove, that Xavier, in this instance, had walked in the steps of his great prototype, and assigned the ministration of the Sacrament to his companions. But as our author presses us with these statements, and implies that this was the usual task of Xavier, while of course his colleagues were not idle, we must again ask, where are the results? If the conversion of whole cities, and the Christianizing in six years of 200,000 heathen on the Comorin coast,—“*all of whom*, even mere children, readily presented their necks to the executioners,”¹—if these are but samples of the constant work and success of Xavier, as Mr. Marshall would have us believe them to be, how comes it that we do not read of the conversion of the whole land? Why is it that Nobili, commencing his career in the same locality, pronounced Xavier’s work a failure? Why has his own labour left so small a result? It is not a matter of faith, but of common daylight fact, that these Comorin converts, did not then, do not now, diffuse inland, a knowledge of the faith.

Lastly, Mr. Marshall tells us that the heathen of Comorin (of whose existence after the work done among them we might surely expect to hear no more) worship “the old idol of the *Great Father*,”² that is Xavier. Mr. Marshall records this fact with undisguised satisfaction, and we shudder as we read it. He thus unconsciously appends to his narrative a most awful and affecting moral. How it would disquiet his divine rest, could that blessed saint know of the dishonour and the shame thus done him by the heathen who act out, by the Christian who delights in recording this iniquity. But this is Mr. Marshall’s method of vindicating the character of one whom he tells us we can no more appreciate than the stocks and the stones can.³ After the noble and exemplary labours, the devoted life, and, as Mr. Marshall will have it, miraculous deeds of Xavier India has acquired one more Buddha, and the heathen remain to be converted from the worship of the apostle. So says Mr. Marshall.⁴

Mr. Venn’s work is more impartial, and it is less vigorous than

¹ P. 333. This was in 1548. Now Acosta, in 1570, in his “Commentary” or digest of the *Epistolæ Indicæ*, up to that time, says, “In 1565 the Christians of Cape Comorin, of Goa, and of the mountain region of Cochin were 300,000;” inclusive of those Syrian Christians who had been induced to renounce the Nestorian heresy.—Venn, 76.

² P. 330.

³ P. 328.

⁴ Mr. Marshall finds a proof of the holiness of Xavier in the circumstance that his body did not corrupt. It would have been useful had Mr. M. ascertained whether the saint’s remains are now in ashes or not. But we can assure Mr. M. that this is no sure mark of sainthood. It happens that some forebearers of the writer, (a heretic, Mr. M. regards him,) rest in the chancel of a certain church, and do not decay. This perhaps may be in consequence of there being in the possession of the eldest male of his family a certain phial, blessed by a pope, and certified to contain a portion of the bones of S. James. Whether really such before, or only made such by the pontifical certification, these bones are in ashes now, whether Xavier’s are or not.

that which has hitherto engaged our attention. The work is neatly executed. But on the general subject of missions it contains no confession of our failures; and scarcely an acknowledgment of the successes of the Roman Church; neither does Mr. Venn seem at all conscious of the fact that the responsibilities of our Church are wholly incommunicable, that they cannot be shared with any sect whatever. Mr. Venn, like many other pious and charitable men, seems to labour under the idea that while dissent is an evil, there can be such a thing as an orthodox dissenting body. Such a body cannot exist without a formal denial of more than one article of the Apostles' Creed; and for our part, we cannot help seeing in the confederation of the Church with Lutheran and other missionaries in India not only an act of most criminal inconsistency and something worse, but a mode of procedure from which nothing but the shameful and disastrous consequences we have been compelled to witness, could have been fairly anticipated. It is no alleviation to our poignant distress in witnessing the irrational and childish proceedings of our missionary conductors, to learn that a more systematic body has failed as signally. We heartily wish that Mr. Venn had taken a more genial and generous view of Xavier. But he strikes the keynote of his whole performance in his preface where he decries the "romance of missions." What does Mr. Venn really mean? If he sees the learned, the rich, the illustrious of his native land abandoning in the fervour of uncalculating self-devotion their ease, their prospects, and their associations at home, for the perils of a missionary life, and in obedience to a divine thirst to suffer for CHRIST—he is, what this book would by no means lead us to think him, a man of a singularly potent imagination. Would to God that were a fact, which as a creation of the fancy he condemns. Would to God there were some enthusiasm kindled in the Church, to complete its numbers from among the heathen, and hasten the advent of the Son of God. But such an awakening as we pray for here, we cannot hope to witness until our whole system of societies is reorganized, until the Church at home girds herself to the work in earnest, and until such disheartening and damping books as Mr. Venn's are prohibited.

For Mr. Venn is decidedly of the "Gummidge" school. He is constitutionally incapable of appreciating Xavier. His book is rather an indictment than a biography. Instead of loving Xavier for those human weaknesses which marred the perfectness of his character, and impeded, according to our author, the success of his undertakings, Mr. Venn sermonises not a little over these blemishes, and seems to indulge in no little triumph at the discovery of them. Although professing to have a peculiar horror of Romish errors, he is so grudging and captious that he is unable to glorify God for that triumphant grace, which despite erroneous notions, and a corrupted creed, produced so eminent a saint. When he asks "how

is Xavier to be acquitted of dishonesty;"¹ when he states, "we look in vain in Xavier's correspondence for *any indication* of the spirit which spoke out in the writings of S. Paul;"² "that his spirit did not differ from that of a Mussulman,"³ that "his sentiments were debased by superstition and creature dependence;"⁴ that "of the peculiar duties of an evangelist to the heathen he had no conception;"⁵ that "a want of thorough truthfulness is conspicuous in all his correspondence,"⁶ Mr. Venn does more dishonour to himself than injustice to the libelled saint. But when he is so rash as to say, that Xavier's "pretensions fall short of those of Samuel Marsden,"—who enriched himself by farming—or "of Henry Martyn," who never made a convert—"or of Williams," who speculated in tobacco to his own great gain, and the very material loss of the heathen to whom he sent himself,⁷ Mr. Venn, we will be bold to say, draws upon himself deservedly both ridicule and contempt. For our own part we cannot read such comments without the profoundest regret for the line adopted by a servant of CHRIST, whose position at all events entitles him to be regarded as one who has learned the "truth as it is in JESUS." We lay aside the book with a feeling little short of disgust. In the rapid outline which we propose furnishing to our readers of the life, and character, and labours of Xavier, we should have been glad to have been able to follow Mr. Venn's guidance. His portentous narrowness and spiritual insensibility constrain us to part company with him at once, and to resort to him only for a few extracts from the letters of the illustrious missionary.

In the year of grace 1506, on the 7th of April—a day memorable among the birthdays of Englishmen—was born Francis Xavier of Navarre, in the castle of Xavier in Navarre; destined to become the most famous in a family which could trace its descent through five hundred years, and claimed kindred with the House of Bourbon and the family of S. Lewis. Carefully educated during his boyhood at home, he hastened at the early age of eighteen to complete his studies in Paris. Here it was, when least of all things contemplating the "religious" life, that the companion of his college life, Ignatius Loyola, induced him to become a member of the association he was about to form. All his secular purposes were at once laid aside, and the year 1534 saw him one of a society of seven, formed for the purpose of converting the unbelievers. The year 1538 found him lingering in Rome; and in 1540 he set forth for the Indian mission, in the room of an associate who at the last moment had fallen ill. It is a subject for thanksgiving that he was thus early withdrawn from the overpowering influence of Loyola, and that his lofty and independent spirit was left comparatively free and uncurbed to run its grand career. One of his ardent and affectionate nature felt all the more, we may believe, the

¹ P. 56. ² P. 67. ³ P. 79. ⁴ P. 120. ⁵ P. 145. ⁶ P. 257. ⁷ P. 261.

painfulness of that self-sacrifice when he forbore, on passing near his old home, to visit his aged mother. His was not the only tender heart which has shrunk from repeating a farewell which it knows will be, as touching this life, for ever. In 1541, on his thirty-fifth birthday, Xavier sailed from Lisbon, and in the May of the following year he arrived at Goa. There he began that mission to the Gentiles which God brought to an end in ten years and a few months, December 2, 1552. King John, acquitting himself as a true nursing-father to the Church, sent forth Xavier fully furnished with all the spiritual and secular supports he himself could supply, or which he could procure from the Church at home. This was worthy of the king. It illustrates no less strongly the devotion of Xavier that he forsook, when called to do so, all the accessories of temporal dignity and ease as cheerfully as in the first instance he resigned all the noble prospects which had opened out to him of worldly promotion, while he was a student in the College of S. Barbe at Paris. Thus he writes while at Goa, in language peculiarly touching and instructive :

“The miseries of a long voyage ; the dealing with other people’s sins, when you are oppressed with your own ; a permanent abode among the heathen, and this in a land where you are scorched by the sun ; all these things are indeed trials. But if they be endured for the cause of GOD, they become great comforts, and sources of many heavenly pleasures. I am persuaded that those who truly love the cross of CHRIST esteem a life thus passed in difficulties a happy one ; and regard an avoidance of the Cross, or an exemption from it, a kind of death. For what death is more bitter than to live without CHRIST, when once we have tasted His preciousness, to desert Him, that we may follow our own desires ? Believe me, no cross is to be compared with this Cross. On the other hand, how happy it is to live in dying daily, and in mortifying our own will, and in seeking not our own, but the things that are JESUS CHRIST’S. I trust that through the merits and prayers of our holy mother the Church, in which is my chief confidence, and through the prayers of its living members to which you belong, our LORD JESUS CHRIST will sow the Gospel seed in this heathen land by my instrumentality, though a worthless servant. Especially if He shall be pleased to use such a poor creature as I am for so great a work, it may shame the men who were born for great achievements ; and it may stir up the courage of the timid, when, forsooth, they see me who am but dust and ashes, and the most abject of men, a visible witness of the great want of labourers.”—I. 10, P. 10.

Want of space requires us to forego some other extracts which even more strongly than that now given, go to prove what a deep and experimental knowledge of the truth as it is in JESUS was enjoyed by Xavier. His letters, which are often full of the warmest expressions of spiritual joy, also abound with passages which are very touching, as “*suspiria de profundis*,” and acknowledgments of

the castings down and disquietings of his heart, such as every Christian reads of in the Psalms, and learns by the evidence of his own emotions. It is in keeping with such a sensitive nature that Xavier should often think very sanguinely, often very despondently of his labours, and that in the infirmity of the flesh he should betray a yea, yea, and nay, nay temper. And yet we are disposed to think, that if we were possessed of the whole state of the case—if instead of the inevitable onesidedness of an epistolary narrative, we had a *stereoscopic* representation of his real position, we should find that Xavier's apparent fickleness of purpose is traceable to the entanglements in which he found himself with the home government and its Indian representative. His first and very successful labours were expended on reforming the Europeans at Goa, and then the scarcely less nominal Christians of Comorin. His visit to the King of Travancore in 1545, marks his first actual address to the heathen. Here his labours were greatly blessed; although as we have stated some pages back, we must throw overboard the legend of the ten thousand baptised by Xavier's own hand in one month. From Travancore his thoughts were directed to the northern part of Ceylon, and other isles of the Gentiles in the Indian Archipelago; thither he transferred himself in the summer of 1545, and returned to India in 1548, after experiencing the same kind of successes and defeats which he had already become familiar with on the Continent. From India, as the scene of his missionary labours, he took his final departure in the April of the following year.

This final departure from India marks the close of the first epoch in the missionary life of Xavier. Here then we must make a few remarks on the work of Xavier. Mr. Marshall, as we have seen, is clamorous for results; we are jealous for the honour of a true servant of CHRIST; and we refuse to speak as Mr. Marshall does, in the spirit of a coveted supremacy, or to concede that any figures in the carnal arithmetic of statistics can weigh or measure the labours and the result of the labours of Francis Xavier. Nay, we will go further, and avow our belief that *failure*, after the most saintly efforts and self-denials to propagate the Christian Faith, cannot but be as acceptable to the LORD Himself, Who finally conquered, by and through defeat, as success itself, which after all could only be His own gift. In no true or proper sense of the term, can Xavier be called, the Infallible Chair notwithstanding, the Apostle of the Indies. Such a title can only be assumed to the discredit of the labours of S. Thomas, and in violation of the Divine warning about building upon another's foundation. Without going so far back as S. Thomas, we must never lose sight of the fact that the Catholic Church, when Xavier landed at Goa, was not only established, but dominant, and possessed of not only the dignity but the authority of an ecclesiastical establishment. Indo-European society then, we write with all the

fear of Mr. Marshall before our eyes, although composed of professing Christians of the Roman obedience, was thoroughly defiled, was desperately dissolute, even according to the testimony of Xavier. Hence in India Xavier was a reformer, not a missionary; and as labouring among the subjects of the King of Portugal, he was fettered and confined by the entanglements of political life. His letters and his actions betray throughout that he felt himself unequal to these unanticipated and unavoidable impediments. The squabbles and heartburnings among religious authorities in no slight degree helped to discomfort, if not embitter, the temper of Xavier.¹ Mr. Venn seems haunted with the idea that the Church of Rome in Xavier's time, and that a section of the Church of England now believes, that a remedy for all possible evils was and is to be found in the appointment of missionary Bishops. We will leave Mr. Venn to enjoy his amiable delusion. Those who choose to understand the subject, and who have no terror of declining subscription lists before their eyes, will see that Xavier in India was in no true sense a missionary Bishop at all. Embarrassed by home engagements, ecclesiastical and political, it enhances our admiration for this servant of CHRIST, that he should have so long and so heroically made head against all obstacles. That his mission to India was a failure, we have the authority of his own act in leaving India; we have the evidence of the work done; we have the testimony of one who we may suppose was no impartial reporter. The Abbe Dubois went to India in 1790 as a Jesuit missionary; after twenty-five years' labouring in the south of India, he published "Letters on the State of Christianity in India, in which the conversion of the Hindoos is considered as impracticable, 1823." From this volume Mr. Venn quotes, at p. 165, the following conclusive statement.

"Francis Xavier, entirely disheartened by the invincible obstacles he everywhere met in his apostolic career, and the apparent impossibility of making real converts, left the country in disgust, after a stay in it of only two or three years. The disappointment and want of success of Xavier ought to have been sufficient to damp the most fervent zeal of the persons disposed to enter the same career. When a man of his temper, talents, and virtues had been baffled in all his endeavours to introduce Christianity in India, his successors could scarcely flatter themselves with the hope of being more fortunate."

What we have marked off as the second period in the missionary

¹ "I had hoped on my return from Japan to enjoy some repose after all the fatigues I had undergone. But no; there is no comfort for me. Far from that, I found only grief upon grief, and each in succession more poignant than the preceding. I found lawsuits arising from a quarrelsome temper. Nothing is stirring around me but squabbles, disputes, divisions, to the great scandal of the people. Alas, this was not the work I so earnestly enjoined at my departure for Japan! What do I find? Little or no obedience! Oh, my God, may Thy holy Name be always praised!" III. 4, F. 96. Quoted by Venn, p. 215.

life of Xavier covers in all about four years to the time of his death, inclusive of two years and three months spent in Japan. Here a stranger among strangers, utterly removed from the impediments which hitherto had stopped his way, Xavier really made good his title of Apostle. He was himself, as he acknowledges and regrets,¹ wholly ignorant of the language. But he had in Paul, a native Japanese, already converted and trained at Goa, the assistance of a zealous and intelligent *ἐρμηνεύτης*; and Paul was shortly afterwards helped by another Japanese convert, Laurence. The effect on Xavier's character produced by this new position seems to have been very purifying and exalting. Writing to Loyola the January before his death he says :

"I can never describe in writing how much I owe to the Japanese, since God through their means penetrated my mind with a clear and intimate conviction of my innumerable sins. Hitherto my thoughts ever wandered beyond myself; I had not searched into that abyss of evil lying deep in my conscience, until amidst the troubles and anguish of Japan my eyes were a little opened, and the good LORD granted me to see clearly, and to hear as it were a present and tangible experience of the necessity of having a friend to keep up an ever attentive and sedulous care over me. Let your holy charity therefore suggest to you what you may do for me whilst subjecting to my government the souls of fathers and brethren of our society. For through the infinite mercy of God I have lately discovered that I am so ill furnished with the necessary qualities for discharging this government, that I ought rather to hope to be myself commended by you to the care and supervision of my brethren, than that they should be committed to my guidance."²

Assisted by Paul, Xavier succeeded not only in making in a little time some four hundred converts, he further conciliated the kings of Amanguchi and Bungo.³ Unhappily he attempted to fortify his missionary position by opening commercial and diplomatic relations with Portugal. It has become quite a maxim in modern times that Christianity is to follow in the wake of commerce, and that the English Church is to employ the wide-spread intercourse of England over the seas as a divinely appointed means for the propagation of the faith. No doubt England furnishes fearfully numerous means for scattering missionaries of the Gospel into all lands. And it may be that because the Church has depended on

¹ "We are dumb through ignorance of their language. For the present we are going back as it were to childhood, in studying the elements of the language." Letter quoted by Venn, p. 181.

² (iv. 1, F. 93.) Venn, 205. Untouched by this affecting passage Mr. Venn accuses Xavier as therein flying "for refuge to a distant arm of flesh." (A very frequent phrase by the way with Mr. Venn.) When S. Paul besought the Hebrews to pray for him, according to the generous exegesis of Mr. Venn, he was resting on an arm of flesh.

³ Only one of the ten miracles admitted into the brief of canonization, the restoring a blind man to sight, is referred to Xavier's sojourn in Japan.

these existing means her labours are so out of proportion to her opportunities. But Xavier did not either adopt or act upon our modern discovery. He had, we must say it, a higher rule of conduct. He endeavoured to make commerce wait upon Christianity, not Christianity on commerce. And yet happy would it have been for the cause he had at heart, had he founded the Church in the Japanese Empire; and instead of binding it to Rome or Lisbon, had left it to run its own hopeful course. It is not Xavier's fault that he did not act otherwise than he did act. The influence of a foreign king among their subjects bred such suspicion in the after emperors, that at last, ninety years from the opening of the mission, it was swept clean away, "as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it, and turning it upside down."

When we contemplate not only the total excision of Christianity from Japan, but also its continued, and for two centuries, successful exclusion, we are compelled to conclude that there must have been in the conduct and development of the Church there something utterly wrong.¹ Else must we admit that the unconquerable CHRIST has been overcome by the sword of the heathen ruler. Nothing can overcome the Church but itself. The supernatural humility, we cheerfully adopt Mr. Marshall's style—of Xavier's heart led him to form a due estimate of his own success. He has not shrunk from putting on record his belief that his last undertaking, like his first, was a failure. When preparing for his visit to China, he says, "I shall succeed in opening it for others, for I can do nothing myself," "*quoniam ego ipse nihil ago.*"

And with this touching sentence we will conclude. Our task has been in some respects an irksome one. We have had to vindicate worth,—we cannot call that departed, which must ever remain as a bright example—on the one side from the damaging results of a coarse and vulgar adulation; on the other hand, from the corrodings of a miserable and offensive envy. Glancing at the missionary question as a whole, despite much that disheartens, we think we cannot say that the age of true spiritual chivalry is past and gone. There is much promise and encouragement in the Australasian and African Missions of our own branch of the Church. We must own with sorrow that as yet we can no more point to a Xavier than we can to a Vincent de Paul. A more careful and reverent study of the missionary work recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, might lead us for the future to mingle a little more discretion with our zeal. The diffusion by Divine Providence of the Greek language enabled the Apostles always to understand and to make themselves understood by those whom they addressed. It

¹ Mr. Venn very properly notes the ominous fact that the image of the Mother and Child were worshipped by the Japanese even before the proper work of the mission in preaching and teaching had begun. P. 182. The remnant who after a struggle of 40 years, survived to perish in the last noyade amounted to 37,000 souls.

seems a very unavoidable conclusion, that while all missions should be vested in, and be conducted by those possessed of apostolic rank, none should be commenced until the intended missionaries shall have a perfect mastery of the language they will have to employ. The Spirit—until this is attained—ought to be regarded as not sanctioning the work in such a quarter. Another evident maxim inculcated by the Book of the Acts, and to the neglect of which much of Xavier's failures may be referred—is the duty of establishing local churches. We have not yet established in any heathen land a self-sustaining native church. Account as we may for our having neglected to do what it is at once our interest, and the distinguishing principle of our own organization to accomplish, the fact remains that we cannot number without the obedience of the Anglican communion—and by the gracious help of Mr. Venn we never shall number—any bishops priests or deacons from the heathen, the fruits of our missionary labours. Bible Protestants ought surely to look to this. If God's work is to be done in God's way—which Mr. Venn does not in the least believe—the sooner we investigate the method adopted by missionaries to convert the heathen the better. It is so certain that God's blessing is on God's work done in God's way, that we have a right to know how it happens that we have nowhere yet localized the Catholic Church in our heathen dependencies. There is indeed a "Romance of Missions" which we think churchmen would be wise to be on their guard against indulging in, which lies in the assumption that this *ἐκκλησία*, contrary as well to the strict meaning of the term, as to the abundant testimony of Holy Scripture, is to number within itself all the nations of the earth; that every nation to whom she offers must eventually through her embrace the Catholic Faith. During the present suspension of miraculous operations, we humbly, but surely gather that where any heathen language is incapable of reproducing the divine ideas of the faith, and the Church is unable out of native material to mature her own divinely appointed organization, that nation and language is not given to the Catholic Church.¹

¹ Compare Acts xvi. 7; the conflict between the zeal of the human agent and the Divine Spirit. See also Olshausen's admirable note.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Are the Anglican Orders valid? (No name either of Printer or Publisher.)

THE pamphlet has this claim upon our attention, that it is written in a more Christian and restrained tone than some that have appeared in the same direction ; it is at all events free from the flippant vulgarity which rendered a certain Canon Williams so harmless three or four years ago. The only point where the writer allows himself to be carried too far in attempting to support his argument by sarcasm, is on p. 4, where, after misstating the palpable meaning of the XXVth Article, he speaks of one of the functions of a priest in the Church of England as being " to read the Gospel of the Last Supper over the bread and wine in *historical* commemoration of CHRIST'S Supper !" This is simply unfair.

Of course the writer can have little to say on this subject which has not been said before ; the only argument which has any claim at all to originality is with respect to the form of Ordination, which he maintains to have been invalid in the time of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth. His argument, or rather assumption, is that the Church of England gave up the true doctrine concerning Priesthood at the Reformation, and also abolished the form in which that doctrine was expressed at ordination, that therefore she did not ordain priests ; and that as there must be priests in order to there being bishops, there could not after a certain time, be any succession. Now it would seem that the whole question as to the form resolves itself into this, What is a priest consecrated to do ? for it would be ridiculous to suppose, that the ceremony of delivering the paten and chalice together with the words then used was of the essence of ordination ; when according to Catalani, this form had not been in use anywhere for above 700 years. Now that the consecration of the priest has a special reference to the Sacraments, as well as to the preaching of the Gospel and the forgiveness of sins, none will deny. So much is clearly set forth in the form used by the Church of England. When it is said, " Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of GOD and of His Holy Sacraments," it would certainly appear, that the Church then intended to invest the priest with power to do all that our LORD commissioned His apostles to do with respect to the Sacraments, as well as with respect to the preaching of the Gospel : to do all therefore which He empowered them to do when He said at the Last Supper, " Do this in remembrance of Me."

With regard to the consecration of bishops, the writer argues that the words, " Accipe spiritum Sanctum," (however translated,) are not sufficient, and that the prayer which begins, " Propitiare Domine," &c., is a necessary part of the form. If this be so, the orders of the Church of England are not so far proved invalid, for we have retained the same prayer, only leaving out the translation of the words, " cornu gratiæ Sacerdotalis." It is true the prayer in our ordination comes quite at the end, even after the communion ; but that can affect nothing, inasmuch as in the Roman pontifical it is not said at the laying on of

hands, and in our ancient forms the hymn, "Veni Creator," was sung between the time of the imposition of hands and the saying this prayer. But, after all, no argument can be urged on the ground that the words used at the consecration of a bishop are insufficient, inasmuch as the difference of opinion which has existed upon this subject is notorious. In several of our ancient forms, the words, "accipe Spiritum sanctum," did not occur at all, and yet the Council of Trent seems to speak of these words as if they were essential to the form. (Session xxiii. Can. iv.)

In conclusion, we must refer our readers to the evidence already adduced by the much abused Courayer and others, with respect to the consecration of Barlow, only remarking that it is altogether improbable that he should have been selected as the consecrator, had there then been any doubt as to his consecration—considering that the main object in having a consecrator himself consecrated under the old forms was to remove all doubt as to the succession. And if there had been then any doubt at all with respect to Barlow, there were bishops in Ireland who would have consecrated, of whose consecration there could be no doubt; but this is an exhausted subject, and after all that has been written on both sides it is probable that no further light will ever be thrown upon it, not even by that "eminent lawyer, Mr. — —" (See p. 22.)

The author of a *Kalendar for the use of the Church of Scotland* (London: Hayes,) has done a truly filial act in giving the Commemorations not only of those Saints who were allowed in King Charles' Book, but also of all others who are known to have adorned that Church in their several generations. At the end of the *Kalendar* there is a brief notice of their lives. The list is scantier than we should have expected.

The results of the controversy that has been going on at Birmingham between the Low Church Clergy and the Dissenters on the occasion of the Bicentenary Commemoration have been ably summed up by "a Priest of the Church of England," in a pamphlet, entitled, *The Verdict of the Non-Conformists*. (Birmingham: Sackett.) Any one who would circulate this penny Tract among the Low Church Clergy would, we believe, be doing them very good service.

Amongst several Sermons preached at the Meetings of Choral Associations, we notice one by the Rev. R. W. RANDALL, (J. H. Parker,) which has the merit of rightly appreciating the true character of Church Music.

Countess Kate, by the author of "The Heir of Redclyffe," (Mozley,) possesses all the attractive liveliness and life-like delineation of character, which render the works of this lady so popular; but it has also in a very noticeable degree a less pleasing characteristic, which has detracted from the usefulness of many of her tales—a tendency to create as well as encourage that overweening estimate of rank and worldly honours, which is so common a weakness amongst us. Miss YONGE is evidently quite unconscious of her influence in this respect, and imagines that

the ease and familiarity with which she treats the lords and ladies, so plentifully sprinkled over her books, will prevent a too great appreciation of titled friends on the part of her young readers; but in this she is greatly mistaken, and she may rest assured, that by making her young readers intimate with the Lord Ernests and Lady Fannies of fiction, she is but filling them with a very worldly desire for similar acquaintances in real life.

A second edition of Dr. NEALE's exquisite *Mediæval Hymns and Sequences*, (Masters,) is enriched by several additions never previously translated or published. We are glad to see that, in his sensible and straightforward preface, he animadverts courteously, but justly, on the Vandalism which has separated some of these noble hymns from the glorious old music to which they have been linked for ages, and adapted them to modern chants, of which a notable instance is the singing of the lovely Alleluistic Sequence to Troyte's chant. We do trust that Dr. Neale's remarks on this point will be taken in good part by those most concerned.

Brother and Sister, (Mozley,) a tale for very young children, has the merit of being cast in a somewhat new form.

Little People (Mozley,) appears to be an account of the true sayings of some real children, which, though natural and simple, seem scarcely worth printing.

The Divine Liturgy, from ancient sources, by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, (Masters,) is one of the most complete and satisfactory of the numerous manuals which have of late been published for the Altar Office. It has the twofold purpose of providing assistance for actual communicants, or for those who only assist at the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It begins with a very judicious preface, containing some excellent practical hints on the proper conduct of communicants, which will we trust have a good effect. In two points we demur a little to Mr. Shipley's directions,—1. His remarks about prostration might have been confined, we think, to the time of reception, when the body should certainly be erect. And 2. We cannot admit that the private use of the first Post-Communion Collect should supersede the public use of it; the edification of the people being in our judgment of far greater importance than the gratification of individual feeling. The work itself contains beautiful and appropriate devotions for the five parts of the Divine Liturgy, the Preparation, Oblation, Consecration, Communion, and Thanksgiving, and finishes with Eucharistic Hymns, Litanies, &c. The volume is compiled, we need hardly say, with a thorough appreciation of the highest truths respecting the Holy Eucharist, and those who have the greatest refinement of mind and depth of devotion will best know how to value it. The work is beautifully got up.

A small work designed for the same purpose, so far as communicants only are concerned, and entitled *The Altar Manual*, (Palmer,) will be found well adapted for comparatively uneducated persons, who would be unable to comprehend or appreciate Mr. Shipley's volume. The instructions and devotions, though taking very high ground, are simple and practical.

We are sorry that we cannot extend the same praise to a *Catechism on the Office of the Holy Communion*, which proceeds from the same "Committee of Clergy." The following are some of our objections.

1. The Office is divided into a very inconvenient multiplicity of parts.
2. The term *Canon* is revived without explanation instead of the Prayer of Consecration.
3. The Prayer for the Church is not called the Oblation which it certainly now is with us, but the first Post-Communion Collect is called by that name.
4. It is implied that the Priest only stands before the altar at the consecration.

These are all we conceive faults in themselves: but what makes them specially noticeable is the circumstance that in none of these points does the "Catechism" agree with the "Manual."

We are glad to see that the excellent speech on *The Prospects and Duty of the Church*, delivered by Mr. DISRAELI at High Wycombe, has been published by Rivingtons as a tract. Had the Conservatives in times past taken pains to understand the Church and been jealous for her interests, their position in the country would have been different from what it is. We trust they now see their error. The speech should be sold at a penny, and not at threepence, it would then have a better chance of meeting with the sale that it deserves.

Family Prayers, compiled by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, is better than any manual which has yet appeared, unless it be that of Mr. Stodart. A striking improvement has been effected on the forms of family devotions commonly in use. The full recognition of holy seasons, and careful following of the course of the Christian year, are all that could be wished; and the tone of the whole is thoroughly catholic, while at the same time perfectly simple and intelligible. The only suggestion we would make is that some of the forms might with advantage be curtailed: at the same time we regret the absence of hymns and psalms.

The Complaint; a Dialogue between Church, Prayer Book, and Altar, and *High Church Doctrines examined by an Officer of the British Army*, are two tracts for which we are indebted to the office of the "Church Review," and we suppose to the laudable efforts of its President to establish a kind of Co-operative Church Press. At the present time we believe that a society alone can force the circulation of Church tracts, so we wish the effort success. Mr. Mann, as a schoolmaster, should know that "THOU BLEED" (vide the hymn at the end of the tract) is not English.

We are glad also to say a word on behalf of the *Church Review*, which after a year of fair success as a weekly paper, is now enlarged, so as to give a full supply of news. There is certainly room for such a periodical, and we trust that our readers will do their best to support it. The weakest part is "The Church throughout the world."

The *Penny Post* also, which is the best of the cheap monthlies, is to be enlarged. *The Church of the People* asks, as it well deserves, for increased support. *The Churchman's Companion*, *The Monthly Packet*, *The Parochial Magazine*, and *Pleasant Hours*, go on as usual, very satisfactorily.

DR. DÖLLINGER ON THE GENTILE AND THE JEW.

The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ: an Introduction to the History of Christianity. From the German of John S. I. Döllinger, Professor of Ecclesiastical History to the University of Munich. By N. DARNELL, M.A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. In Two Volumes. London: Longman. 1862. Pp. 910.

A FEW months since we were called upon to notice a work somewhat similar in subject to the treatise before us now.¹ Pressense's "Religions before CHRIST" made no pretensions to the minuteness and accuracy of detail that characterise these volumes from the pen of Professor Döllinger: in fact, few other countries than Germany could have produced a book which involves so surprising an amount of labour. One turns over the pages in sheer amazement: every treasure-house of ancient lore seems to have yielded up its rich contents; every available source of information has been laid under contribution; the archives of each nation have been ransacked successively. If any one conceives that he possesses a little knowledge upon some of the subjects brought forward by Dr. Döllinger, let him turn to his pages, and he will feel the utter folly of his previous pretensions; he will be met by such a dense phalanx of authorities and facts, that he will feel tempted to close the page for very shame. We do not say this for the sake of finding fault; the book is plainly written, and well and very simply translated. Mr. Darnell has done full justice to his author in this respect. We are very ready to pay him the highest compliment possible upon his performance, and we fulfil our promise by stating, that no one, upon reading the book, would imagine it to have been translated from the German at all; its English dress is made to fit so well, that it appears to be its native guise. Mr. Darnell deserves our thanks upon another score; he has given us no preface of his own. He has left Dr. Döllinger to speak for himself. He has not explained what he has done, or what he has not done; he has left his work to speak for itself. Would that all other translators were guided by so good an example! If of the many persons who will most assuredly buy this work, as a most valuable book of reference, but few have the courage to read it through, the fault will lie rather in the subject itself than with either the author or the translator.

When a vast array of facts have to be compressed into the smallest possible space, there is no room left either for rhetorical

¹ *Ecclesiastic*, Vol. xxiv. pp. 203—216.

flourishes or for philosophical speculation. It implies a very high order of genius, a gift which is given only to a very few, to absorb completely all the details of any given subject, and to bring them out clearly by implication in general statements, by which they are represented. Dr. Döllinger gives us the facts themselves, and perhaps his work is the more useful for his so doing. He has given as the title of his treatise, "The Gentile and the Jew;" in other words, it is a history of Paganism in its various forms, and of Judaism before the epoch of the Gospel. It is divided into ten books, nine of which are devoted to Paganism; the tenth—hardly one-ninth of the whole—being assigned to trace out the developments of that schoolmaster which was to bring us to CHRIST. The contents of the various books are as follows:—I. General view: state of the world. II. Religions: the Hellenic religion. III. The mysteries of the Orphic religious doctrine. IV. Priesthood, divination, oracles, sacrifice and prayers, festivals, temples and images, worship of house-gods. V. Greek philosophy, and its influence on the religious sense and conduct of the people; development of religious ideas among the Greeks from the sixth century before CHRIST. VI. The religions in anterior and middle Asia and in Africa. VII. The religions of the West: Etruria, Rome, Gaul, Germany. VIII. Philosophy and religion in the Roman empire from the end of the Republic to the Antonines. IX. The social and moral state of Greece and Rome, and of the Roman empire. X. Historical development of Judaism. These ten books are subdivided into many—sometimes into seven—sections, each of which contain a large number of sub-sections. This arrangement places the whole matter in its different branches very clearly before the reader, and greatly facilitates the value of the book for the purposes of reference.

For the most part, the book is more truly an encyclopædia of Paganism than an introduction to the history of Christianity. We confess to a dislike of all encyclopædias; and insomuch as this work partakes of this character, our sympathies hardly go with it. Mr. Grote's history of Greece enters more fully into Grecian mythology than does Dr. Döllinger. We learn more of Plato by reading any one of his more philosophical dialogues well and thoroughly, than from any empirical digest of his so-called system of philosophy. We say so-called, because Plato had no system; Aristotle systematized. Plato even in the Republic was but casting about hither and thither, if haply he might find one; but of this more anon. Gibbon and Merivale help us on considerably in our Roman studies; Mr. Max Müller's incomparable history of Sanscrit literature sheds a flood of light upon the old religions of India, which ought to be read with the translation of the Rig Veda by one's side; while the writings of Bournouf open out stores of learning upon the religions of Persia, as well as of the other Iranian countries; for Egyptian

worship must be learned either from the pages of Plutarch, or else from the *Reiseberichte* of Brugsch. One great merit of Dr. Döllinger is, that he has consulted original authorities for the compilation of his elaborate treatise; and as he neither hazards any theories nor attempts any extensive generalizations, the vast mass of facts which are embodied in his pages can be received by the reader with the most implicit confidence.

We would not imply by these remarks that the book is devoid of thought. To deal with subjects so multitudinous and so profound in any way, requires a mind of no common grasp of comprehension; and to deal with them as Dr. Döllinger has dealt with them, indicates a combination of intellectual powers, the gift of which is by no means common, and which is seen more particularly in the seventh, eighth, and ninth books of this treatise, which form in our opinion the most masterly portion of the whole. We cannot help thinking that too much space has been assigned to the Latin literature, religion, and philosophy; more than one third of the entire work (318 pages) being devoted to the Roman people. Yet, perhaps, this cannot be so much regretted, because Dr. Döllinger is so thoroughly at home in treating of all that concerns the Romans; their consideration forms the main feature in his book. His acquaintance with the Greek philosophy is not to be spoken of lightly, as if it were mean or inconsiderable; whilst the Jews and their creed fare, we conceive, somewhat poorly in his hands. Dr. Döllinger opens his book with an account of Rome and the Romans in the time of Augustus, and then goes on to describe those different peoples who were then included under the Latin rule; such as the Gauls, the Spaniards, the inhabitants of the provinces of Asia Minor, of anterior Asia, of Britain, of Macedonia, and of other regions. Dr. Döllinger gives the following graphic picture of Rome:—

“The city of Rome, enriched and splendidly ornamented, as it had been in the last days of the Republic, by rifled treasures of conquered lands, assumed an entirely new aspect under Augustus. The splendour of the Campus Martius, adorned by him with public buildings, far surpassed even the beauty of the old city of the Seven Hills; and with justice might that monarch pride himself on having found a city of brick, and left one of marble in its stead. With each year as it came, the city on the Tiber now developed more and more into a rendezvous for all the nations of the globe. Slaves, dragged together from every land, penetrated with their foreign manners into the interiors of families, and with their strange views into the spirit and modes of thought of the rising generation. Rome was also inundated with independent aliens. From three quarters of the world they pressed to the world’s city, either to lead there a life of greater enjoyment and pleasure, or simply to procure a livelihood; perhaps to return again with what they had there earned to hearth and home. Greek and Syrian inhabitants of

Asia Minor and Egypt sat themselves down in Rome as literati and philosophers, as ministers of luxury, and debauchery, and impurity, or as priests of strange rites and propagators of superstition. Rome had become a Greek city in language and manners, and 'the Syrian waters of the Orontes streamed into the Tiber,'—so the poet afterwards complained in his picture of the manners of his day; while, in a century and a half from Augustus, Athenæus could say whole nations of the East had settled themselves in Rome."—P. 5.

Athenæus here alludes to the Scythians, the Cappadocians, and many of the inhabitants of Pontus. After describing the various provinces in connection with the Roman rule, Dr. Döllinger thus sums up the influence of Rome itself:—

"The great emporium for all, the centre which exercised so powerful an attraction over the educated, the ambitious, the pleasure-seeker, and the greedy of gain of all nations, was, and continued to be, Rome. To her all other cities necessarily looked. Rome was now the epitome of the whole world. Rome in Strabo's time swarmed with scholars from Tarsus and Alexandria. The voice and the standard of the Roman public reacted on taste, and gave the intellectual direction in Greece and Asia. The fortunate provincials who were permitted to stay there sent their literary notices of newly-issued writings, and reports of speeches and witty sayings of famous persons, to their native homes; papers, *acta*, edited at the Imperial Court, kept the remotest provinces informed of the daily life and events in Rome, and even of remarkable trials, speeches, and literary news."—P. 41.

The survey then passes away to the Eastern nations—to Colchis, Iberia, to Arabia and India; and both Brahminism and Buddhism are described in a popular manner. The real scientific treatment of the subject commences with the second, and is continued in the three succeeding books, all of which are devoted to Greek philosophy and Greek religion. The opening section of the Greek religion, upon Pantheism, is perhaps the most beautiful description of the subject that some of our readers may have ever seen. We feel bound to cite Dr. Döllinger's words entire:—

"The deification of nature and her powers, or of particular sensible objects, lay at the root of all the heathen religions, as they existed from old time amongst the nations now united under the Roman empire. The elements, the sun, the heavens, the stars, single natural objects and physical phenomena—it was the deifying and worshipping of these that led to the rise and development of Polytheism. When once a dark cloud stole over man's original consciousness of the Divinity, and, in consequence of his own guilt an estrangement of the creature from the one Living God took place, man, as under the overpowering sway of sense and sensual lust, proportionally weakened therefore in his moral freedom, was unable any longer to conceive of the Divinity, as a pure, spiritual, supernatural, and infinite Being, distinct from the world,

and exalted above it. And then it followed inevitably that, with his intellectual horizon bounded and confined within the limits of nature, he should seek to satisfy the inborn necessity of an acknowledgment and reverence of the Divinity by the deification of material nature; for, even in its obscurity, the idea of the Deity, no longer recognized, indeed, but still felt and perceived, continued powerful; and in conjunction with it the truth struck home, that the Divinity manifested itself in nature as ever present and in operation. And now nature unfolded herself to man's sense as a boundless demesne, wherein was confined an unfathomable plenitude of powers incommunicable and incalculable, and of energies not to be overcome. Everywhere, even where men, past their first impressions of sense, had already penetrated deeper into their inner life, she encountered them as an inscrutable mystery. At the same time, however, a sympathy for naturalism, easily elevated into a passion, developed itself among them—a feeling in common with it and after it—which led again to a sacrifice of themselves, all the more readily made to natural powers and natural impulses. And thus man, deeper and deeper in the spells of his enchantress, and drawn downwards by their weight, had his moral consciousness overcast in proportion, and gave the fuller rein to impulses which were merely physical.”—P. 66.

Ether was first worshipped, then the sun and stars; the worship of the luxurious earth, which spread itself out in all the beauty of a tropical or a sub-tropical vegetation, followed.

“The earth, with her teeming lap, like a nursing mother, comprehending in herself a manifold variety of beneficent influences, but also gathering every living thing again to her bosom, came to be worshipped as the great divinity; and from the deification of particular powers of the earthly and natural, a coherent Polytheism was formed.”—P. 67.

Dr. Döllinger has thus clearly apprehended the true ground of every form of Pantheism. The human mind *must* have something above and beyond itself; and so, when “the dark cloud stole over man's original consciousness of the Divinity,” he left the worship of the higher, and turned himself to adore lower natures; “he served the creature instead of the Creator.”

When Dr. Döllinger comes to describe the Greek mythology in its several personifications, we can speak of his knowledge with the highest respect. He has not merely given an analysis of the particular writer who first either originated it, at least greatly developed the myth, but he has thrown together notices derived from indirect mentions of it, in poets not professedly mythological, and in later writers of another school, who merely use these early creations of the Greek genius, as a peg upon which to hang some important elements of their own teaching. In his treatment of *Apollo* for example, Dr. Döllinger does not content himself with making a series of extracts from the old Homeric hymn, which the blind bard of Chios wrote long before *the* Homer and his *Iliad* were thought

of, and so giving in detail the myths of the Delian and Pythian Apollos; but he enumerates all the forms under which Apollo was worshipped, and all the localities in which this worship was for the most part carried on. He does trace the steps by which the legend became embodied into an oracle; but he tells us also what Plato and Xenophon thought about him, and how they used him. In that most ironical of all dialogues, the *Cratylus*, Plato applies his satirical derivations to Apollo, whose name he says, seems to me *κάλλιστα κείμενον πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, which power comprised a four-fold art, musical, healing, prophetic, and toxic (μουσικὴν—μαντικὴν—ιατρικὴν—τοξικὴν).

"His aid," says Dr. Döllinger, "was invoked particularly against epidemic pestilences, which he sent abroad by his arrows. Ever exulting in his eternal youthfulness, he was also the protector and guardian of manly youth, and warlike courage was his gift. From him the bright, shining, pure God, all that is morally impure and defiled, must be kept aloof. In lieu of the old vengeance of blood, he introduced the expiation for murder. War, conducted in an unrighteous and inhuman manner, was an offence to him. He was generally the representative and expositor of the ideas of moral law to the Hellenes." —P. 82.

We think that Dr. Döllinger goes a little too far, when as a comment upon the words, *ἐκ Δελφῶν δὲ χρὴ νόμους περὶ τὰ θεῖα πάντα κομισάμενος καὶ καταστήσαντας ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐξηγητὰς τοῦτοις χρῆσθαι* (Legg. vi. 759 c.), he states, "All the ordinances pertaining to public worship, must have been, as Plato says, derived from Delphic sources, and be treated as inspirations of Apollo," (p. 83), whereas all he says is, that it is meet, having brought all the divine laws from Delphi, and having appointed interpreters for them, to use them. Yet the whole notice of Apollo is well drawn up.

In his account of the Greek *dæmon*, Dr. Döllinger shows his perfect acquaintance with the Greek feeling. He admits that in Homer there is little or no distinction between the actual god and the *dæmon*—that it was Hesiod who first taught the existence of a whole race of immortal *dæmons*, *dæmons* good and bad; givers of manifold gifts to man, akin to the race of heroes, yet not identical with them, because "there was in substance a marked distinction between a hero who had once been a pilgrim of earth in a mortal frame, and a *dæmon*, spiritual, shadowy, yet conceived to be of divine origin, and always superhuman." (P. 103.) The notion of man's protecting *dæmons*, may be a degradation of the Catholic doctrine of "guardian angels," that same *dæmon* that Menander, as quoted by S. Clemens Alexandrinus, (Strom. v. c. xiv.), calls *ἀγαθὸς μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου*. One aspect of this question Dr. Döllinger has taken no notice of, the treatment of these *dæmons* by the early Christian writers; they drew their authority from the earlier

pagan authors, and thus were enabled to confound the gods with the dæmons, so to ridicule both alike. We must however except Athenagoras, who attributes to Thales the separation between gods, dæmons, and heroes, the last being either good or bad. Lactantius says boldly, (*De Verâ Phil.* iv. 28), "*Ergo iidem sunt dæmones quos fatentur execrandos esse: iidem Dii quibus supplicant.*" Minutius Felix, in his *Octavius*, (c. 25), states, "*Isti igitur impuri spiritus.*" Tatian and S. Clement follow, or rather suggested the same line of argument, which was more telling than strictly true, and more rhetorical than was warranted by the actual facts of the case.

Dr. Döllinger relates with great power, the treatment by Æschylus of Hesiod's old and homely legend of Prometheus, who in this sublime drama is represented as having suffered for the benefits which he conferred upon men, who, while nailed upon his cross of rock, was still strong in the consciousness of his immortality. In reviewing the whole delineation of Prometheus, Dr. Döllinger writes:—

"How wonderfully the broken rays of higher knowledge and primitive tradition here appear; how strangely tinted, yet transparent enough to admit of their original form being recognized! far indeed beyond the ordinary horizon of Hellenic genius, do the ideas of this pregnant drama extend; so far, that possibly it was but little understood, and for what we know, the succeeding Greek literature did not venture much upon the subject; in truth, the representation of God suffering, stands out here in marked contrast with the notion of Hellenic Paganism on the same subject; there the god, as for instance, Dionysos, Atlas, and Adonis, is but nature withering and dying off to find a fresh bloom in death. Here, however, the god suffers for man's sake, as their benefactor, and thus there are in Prometheus three personalities, and three functions in objects mixed up throughout one with the other. In his enmity and defiance of the world's ruler, he resembles the fallen archangel, converted into Satan. And as at a later period the Gnostic sects contemplated, as man's benefactor, the serpent enticing our first parents to eat the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge; so here Prometheus, the impartor to them of forbidden science and art, is represented as the protecting and rescuing genius of man; and again, as of his own free will, suffering for them. At the same time he is the primal man and representative of the whole species, as rebelling against the Deity and his law, and earning in requital a sad and painful existence, though he descry in the distance, a redeemer and a divine deliverer, who will give himself up to death for him."—P. 298.

Though we fail to see the resemblance between the Gnostic tempter and the Prometheus of Æschylus, we cannot fail to see great power and much beauty in this summary of his fate and actions. After further analysis of the teaching of the same writer as to Zeus, we read, "In a poet like Æschylus, who as a Pythagorean," &c. (*Vol. I. p. 299*). Here is a fact that one would never learn from the

plain reading of Æschylus himself, nor should we glean it from the writers of his own country; it rests upon the solitary assertion of Cicero, (who made the strangest mistakes in pretending to a very extended knowledge of Greek literature,) not that Æschylus was a Pythagorean, but "*almost* a Pythagorean," (Tusc. ii. 10). Even Cicero does not venture upon the naked statement which is made by Dr. Döllinger.

On the Greek *mysteries*, and the mystery gods, Dr. Döllinger has well shown Plato's views; citing two passages from the Republic, in which, after denouncing the *ἀγῶρται* or pedlar-priests, he speaks of the absolutions and purgations of the sacrifices for both the living and the dead, which purgations they call (*τελεάς*), mysteries which absolve us from the evils of another life. And again, condemning the fables or myths, he says, "That they were heard in secrecy by the fewest people, after sacrificing a *hog* with great and wonderful sacrifice." The hog was a characteristic sacrifice of the Eleusinian mysteries. We would call our readers' attention to the following passage, upon these mysteries. "There are other ways still in which Plato's dislike to the mysteries peeps out; for example, where he is describing the migration of souls into new bodies, according to the degree of their education; such of these, as have been occupied in divination and the mysteries, he fixes in the fifth class only. (Phædr. p. 248, D.) Again, when ridiculing the mystery poets, he exclaims, 'What better recompence can they give to virtue, than an eternity of intoxication!' Lastly, when with a significant side-hit at the state mysteries, he says, that the most perfect mysteries are those, which the philosopher celebrates while he revels in the recollection of that which he has seen in a former existence with God." Vol. I. p. 132, 133. We will not dispute the point, but take it for granted that the composition in which all this occurs, and which Socrates calls the speech of Stesichorus and a palinode upon love, does really represent Socrates' own views. We find that they who are in the fifth class shall have a life either prophetic (*μαντικόν*), or initiative (*τελεστικόν*), but we fail to discover the "significant side-hit at the mysteries," in the following passage, which we have some doubt as to whether it is represented in the latter portion of our quotation from Dr. Dollinger.

"Wherefore rightly it is the philosophical mind alone which is winged, for towards these things, (i.e., the things that really are), according to his power is he ever directed in thought, by which being a god, he becomes divine; and a man moreover rightly using such memorials, ever perfecting himself in perfect mysteries, alone becomes truly perfect. But standing apart from human interests, and being inclined towards the divine, by the many he is considered as an enthusiast; his inspiration was concealed from the multitude."

The most that the philosopher does, is to expose himself to the imputation of being crazed (*διακείμενος ὡς μανικῶς*) when a glimpse

of the beauty of the world above, wings his soul to fly aloft in desire, but not in power, and so he can but gaze aloft, forgetful of the lowlier details of life. In all this, whether taken literally or ironically we can see no "side-hit at the state mysteries." Now this is precisely what we do see in the Peace of Aristophanes, when Trygæus asks Mercury to lend him three drachms for a little pig, (*ἰς χοίρειδον*), because he wished to be initiated (*μυηθῆναι*) before he died, (l. 373,) and also when he bids Mercury to hold his peace and not to betray him (*πρὸς τῶν κρεῶν*) by the meats, which were used at these mysteries, upon which the Scholiast says, that to those who are initiated, it is the custom to sacrifice of necessity, a young pig. In the Acharnians, the Megarian tells his daughters to utter the voice of the pigs of the mysteries (*χοίρων μυστηρικῶν*), upon which the Scholiast observes, (*ὅτι ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις τῆς Δήμητρος χοῖρος θύεται*). A few verses forward in the same play, Dicæopolis asks the Megarian, what he brings, the answer is, "pigs for the mysteries," which the Scholiast explains precisely as before. Upon its intrinsic merits, for its own sake we should not have noticed a subject so unimportant, with such a multitude of engrossing themes before us, but an author's accuracy is best tested in such minute points as these, for he is naturally more careful over those portions of his book, which have the most important bearings, and he is tempted to write unguardedly where he fancies no great occasion for accuracy exists. Dr. Döllinger's proposition is true; the mysteries were a source of evil, and they were denounced by the best men of their times. His illustration of the fact is not a happy one—he has given a meaning to a very beautiful passage of Plato, which is foreign to the context, and has passed over Aristophanes, whose ridicule must be taken as a test of the general feeling amongst the really superior men of his day. In illustrations of popular Greek worship and mythology Dr. Döllinger often uses Aristophanes and his Scholia, in a most happy manner, which shows that he was fully aware of the valuable nature of the testimony which the great satirist gave upon such subjects.

In his notice of Greek philosophy, after an account of Pherecydes of Syros, of Diogenes, Pythagoras, the Eleatic schools of Xenophanes, Parmenides, Empedocles, and of Anaxagoras, we come to the *Sophists*, who are treated by Dr. Döllinger with great carefulness and moderation. He does not mingle in the popular abuse of them which is so common in the present day, nor does he subscribe Mr. Grote's most ably argued theory of their high character as teachers of morality. Their merits and demerits are thus given in the work before us:—

"The men at that time working at Athens, with the greatest success, as teachers of rhetoric, and of a popular philosophy calculated for active life and the exigencies of the moment, and who, as the people's instructors, supplied the place of the earlier poets and rhapsodists, were generally

called Sophists. Their special object was to train young men to play a useful part in public affairs and the administration of the republic. Gorgias, Protagoras, Prodicus, and others, as they passed from city to city, earned themselves fame and wealth throughout the whole of Greece; and became the famous men of their day, by their endeavours to popularize the stores of knowledge which had been treated more exoterically by previous inquirers, and by their having an answer at hand to every question equally, and a speech to make upon every conceivable subject, an offer made in terms by Hippias. They did not form a philosophical school of their own and had no community of doctrine. Every one went his own way independently of the other. Generally they had no more in common one with the other than was required by the similarity of their pursuits, and of the wants they undertook to satisfy. The thing which earned their numerous scholars and admirers was not so much the novelty of their speculations as their rhetorical readiness, the ease with which they understood making themselves substantially masters of every kind of subject, and a boldness of assertion hitherto strange to the ears and minds of their fellow-men. On the whole, a sceptical tendency was a necessary consequence of their influence on a people, whose intellect was principally formed by reading mythological poems; above all, in Athens, where frequent contact with strangers made them more alive to the variations and internal contradictions of the pagan religious system than to what they held in common."—Vol. i., p. 269—70.

Dr. Döllinger, on leaving the Sophists, considers next Socrates, their great opponent. The leading features of his character are well sketched in: his society, that of an irresistible enchanter; his easy way of and ready will for imparting knowledge; his vast colloquial power; his "artistic power of well-weighed dialectic, with which he destroyed unreal knowledge;" "an ironical instinct, drawing everything into the grasp of his own dissecting process of thought, while simultaneously undeceiving himself and others." All this contributed to make him a vision of wonder past imitation, and a deep and lasting mover of souls. Yet when we come to the formal definition of his ethics, we cannot subscribe such a summary as this:—

"It was the doctrine of Socrates that all virtue rests on knowledge, as well as that evil has its only root in defect of knowledge or in error; and wherever only true knowledge is to be found, there it is ever victorious over all affections and attractions of evil. So completely were the ideas of philosophy and virtue blended with him, that he unhesitatingly asserted all that is done with knowledge to be good, and no man with knowledge to be bad."—Vol. i. p. 275.

We object altogether to this *ex cathedra* way of stating the Socratic teaching. It confounds the first principles of the philosophy itself with the method in which it seemed best both to

Socrates and Plato to expound that philosophy. Again, Dr. Döllinger receives with implicit faith, as veritable pictures of the true Socrates, the pictures which are drawn of him by Xenophon, in his *Memorabilia*. We believe that Xenophon was wholly incapable of fathoming the real depths even of the Socratic teaching. His pictures may be true *as far as they go*, but they only represent one side of the Socratic mind. The Xenophontic Socrates falls far more below the real Socrates than the Platonic Socrates rises above it. The real Socrates must be a mean between his two exponents. Socrates was concerned in trying to lead to self-contemplation, clever, but unthoughtful and ignorant men, to undo the pernicious maxims of the Sophists, one of which was, that it was all-sufficient if a man could only speak,—never mind how little he really *knew*. It was his anti-sophist teaching that led him to lay such a paramount stress upon knowledge. He certainly did say that knowledge was wisdom,—that every wise man is only wise in that thing of which he has a knowledge. Why did he say this? Because the Sophists offered to make people wise about everything, with no real knowledge of any one single thing; their teaching demanded this most strenuous and unequivocal contradiction. Socrates works this same sentiment out in all his dialogues. In his *Laches* he shows that courage is a portion of that one moral idea of virtue, which Dr. Döllinger says that Socrates had no thought of. The argument is very simple. If a man rushes into danger, without knowing that it is danger, his action does not spring from courage, but from rashness. It is only when he undertakes a dangerous enterprise, knowing it to be dangerous, that he is a courageous man. In the *Meno* we find that prudence is a part of virtue, of virtue considered as a science that may be taught, which virtue is a kind of knowledge. The argument comes out in its strongest form in the *Philebus*; for when *Philebus* says that he should have everything that he wanted in having joy, Socrates answers: "In living thus you would constantly enjoy the greatest pleasures; but wanting reason, and memory, and knowledge, and true opinion, you would not, in the first place, even know whether you were pleased or not, having no particle of wisdom." (§ 10.) Bearing these remarks in mind, that for teaching purposes as a sort of *argumentum ad hominem*, Plato wrote thus, we think Dr. Döllinger to be hardly fair to Socrates, when he says,—

"There was no supreme good for him in general as THE moral idea, having its object in itself, but only a good of a relative kind, directing itself by a coincident wish, the profitable of the moment, and the pleasure arising from the sentiments of the agreeable. Moral action consisted in a searching and a calculating selection of the more useful and more agreeable. Wisdom and virtue should accordingly extenuate themselves in the scales, and by the measure of greater or less pleasure

or pain, only possible through the medium of an accurate knowledge of the objects awakening these sensations in us ; and that even the sinner is only in defect of not knowing the better, allowing himself to be seduced, that is, by the less agreeable, or that which is but apparently and superficially agreeable."—Vol. i., p. 276.

And this because in an indirect way he taught that they who are overcome of pleasure, side with the greater evil rather than with the greater good, because they do not reflect upon the "end of those things" as they ought to do.

The very elementary and unsystematic nature of the Socratic dialogues ought to make us wish to indulge in no very broad generalizations concerning them ; above all, to study the context in which any sentiment may be found, and to trace its bearings upon that context, before we proceed to determine what the doctrine really is which it seems at first sight to state. The mistakes that have arisen from neglecting these cautions are manifold in the best writers. Plato is either known thoroughly, or he cannot be known at all.

The following is an exceedingly well written passage on the contrast between Plato and Aristotle, but the opposition between these writers is carried a little too far. Let any one compare the *Euthydemus*, p. 291, with the *Ethics*, I. ii. 56 ; or the *Philebus*, p. 20, with the *Ethics*, I. vii. 86 ; or the *Republic*, pp. 352, 353, with the *Ethics*, I. vii. 11 ; or the descriptions of philosophy in the *Phædo*, the *Symposium*, and the *Republic*, with the *Ethics*, X. viii. 13, or X. vii. 3 ; or the *Lysis* with the *Ethics*, viii. 1—6 : where one finds the germs of Plato's thoughts upon politics—the chief good, man's work, the excellency of philosophy, *φρόνησις*, pleasure, friendship, and the like—all expanded and systematized in Aristotle, we cannot allow that these philosophers are in the main so opposed to each other in their doctrine, however ungratefully and vindictively Aristotle may have spoken of Plato in his writings.

"The two great thinkers of antiquity form, in fact, an almost complete contrast. If Plato is eminently the philosopher of intellect, Aristotle is transcendently the philosopher of nature. If the one was ever striving to soar above nature into the regions of the ideal world, the other would depart as little as ever he could from the solid ground of nature and experience. If Plato, little troubled about a strongly articulated and conclusive system, was only occupied in the continual fashioning of his ideal kingdom and the dialogistic representation of its development, Aristotle, on the contrary, the dogmatic systematizer, to a style devoid of ornament, compact, and reducing everything to the shortest possible expression, united an accurate knowledge of all the accomplishments of the day, maintained a perfect mastery over his matter, and sometimes exhausted in a few lines subjects which Plato

had spun out into several dialogues. Where the one entered with zest into figures and mythical representations, and clothed objects with a poetic brilliancy, there the other confined himself, with almost mathematical rigour and dryness, to the naked, sober reality. Profound where he appropriates his master's ideas, modifies, or alters them, Aristotle appears no less acute in refutation, particularly where he has to deal with the Pythagorean aspect of Platonic philosophy with the confusion of the systems of numbers and ideas, and where combating Plato's views of matter and the formation of the world. Still, on the whole, Aristotle was not so powerful nor so speculative and creative an intellect as a critical one, assuming a polemic attitude to the teaching of others."—Pp. 333, 334.

It is only here and there that we have been able to give a specimen of this ponderous work of Dr. Döllinger; a review of such a vast undertaking this short paper does not pretend to be. The work of its compilation was an immense one, and great industry as well as much intellectual power have been brought to bear upon it. Yet the book is not to our taste; in part being too superficial, and altogether too diffuse. Dr. Döllinger has attempted to do more than any man could do well; and had we taken up his poor, meagre disquisition upon Philo, we should have found no more reason to sympathise with his treatment of the Jew than we did with the scanty measure of justice that Socrates has met with at his hands. The "Gentile and the Jew" is a book of vast and cumbrous learning; we trust that its readers may find it to be of corresponding substance and profit, and that our copious extracts will give some notion of the style of the work, whilst we regret that the extremely interesting books upon the Roman religion and habits we are obliged to pass by, without even a notice of their contents.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Sermons on the Acts of the Apostles. By JOHN HAMPDEN GURNEY, M.A., late Prebendary of S. Paul's, and Rector of S. Mary's, Marylebone. London: Rivington. 1862.

The Acts of the Apostles: an Exposition of the Leading Events recorded in that Book. By a Clergyman. London: Masters. 1862.

WHILST men remain in peaceful possession of their inheritance, their title-deeds are often hidden in the deep recesses of the muniment room. There is no need of taking them out and examining them, until some controversy arises respecting the tenure by which the possessions are held. This may account for the comparative neglect with which the Acts of the Apostles was treated in the early ages of the Church. This Book was the Church's charter; and whilst the provisions of that charter were unquestioned, its value and authority were not lessened by the fact that it was seldom drawn forth to the light. The practical duties of Christian life consisted in the following of the SAVIOUR's example; and since the acts of His life were contained in the four Gospels, it is but natural to suppose that the Fathers would have devoted more attention to commentaries on these than on the Acts of the Apostles. For the rest, the succession of the Christian Priesthood, Baptism, Confirmation, and the fulfilment of the Church's mission were facts always patent to the eyes of Christians; and therefore they had little need of inquiring how these things were done by those who first bore the Apostolic commission.

This may be the reason, not only why so few commentaries on the Acts were written, but also why those that were written were not carefully preserved. The expositions of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodorus of Mopsuestia, have perished. The neglect was nevertheless only comparative; for "the Acts" was never omitted in any catalogue of the canonical Scriptures, and both in Asia and Africa it was read publicly in the Church during the interval between Easter and Pentecost. To have been rejected by Marcion, Cerinthus, and the Manichees argues the importance in which it was held by orthodox Christians. It is, moreover, quoted by Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and more frequently by Irenæus. Tertullian speaks thus strongly of the value of this holy Book of Scripture: "*Quam scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritum Sanctum possunt agnoscere, discentibus missum,*" &c.¹

¹ De Præscript. cont. Hæret. c. 22.

In the fourth century, the general ignorance of the laity respecting the Acts of the Apostles attracted the attention of S. Chrysostom, who endeavoured to remedy the evil by the composition of fifty-four homilies on this Book. If the words in the commencement are genuine, πολλοίς τούτο τὸ βιβλίον οὐδ' ὅτι ἔστι γινώσκον ἔστιν, they must be accounted for either as a rhetorical exaggeration, or else as spoken only in reference to the ignorance of the multitude, since it was read, as S. Chrysostom himself bears witness, in annual course. The people, therefore, could not be unaware of the existence of "the Acts," and for this reason Dr. Mill suspected the genuineness of the passage. Bellarmine argued in its defence; and for ourselves we see no difficulty, if we adopt the opinion of Erasmus and Fabricius, that these words rather show that the ignorance of some particular persons was condemned by S. Chrysostom, than the negligence of the universal Church in his time.

At a later period Œcumenius and Theophylact commented on "the Acts," but in recent times very few special expositions of this Book have been given to the public. The Church of Rome has added too much to primitive Apostolic tradition to render it safe for her to examine the foundations too minutely; whilst the Protestant bodies, on the other hand, having rejected Episcopacy, could only read their own condemnation in these records. For this reason we suppose it is, that whilst many German commentators have handled portions of this Book, very few have attempted an exposition of the whole. The same cause for silence does not exist in the English Church, whose institutions profess to be more exactly modelled after the pattern of Apostolic custom than those of any other church in Christendom; and yet, whilst we find a Meyer, an Olshausen, and a Baumgarten amongst the Germans, with the honourable exception of Dr. Wordsworth, no English Churchman has attempted anything like a satisfactory exposition of this holy Book. Mr. Ford has collected together many useful passages from our best divines, which have reference to the Acts; but a systematic exposition, which shall be at once distinct, orthodox, and suited to the comprehension of the unlearned, remains as yet a desideratum. These times are not like those of the early Church, when Christians could afford to lay up their title-deeds in safe keeping, because the possession of that which these conveyed was unchallenged, and the acts which the Apostles did were done still, and they knew the reason why they were done. We believe that if in modern times the Acts of the Apostles had been brought more prominently to view, we should not have had reason to lament that ignorance respecting Church authority, the Priesthood, and the Sacraments, which has been the fruitful parent of discord and schism. We have often regretted that Mr. Burgon's plain commentary did not extend into the Acts, and therefore we welcome

any attempts to throw light on these sacred records as the most valuable step towards the restoration of peace and unity which could be made.

With these feelings we opened the two volumes, the titles of which appear at the head of this article. Concerning the first we feel some little difficulty in speaking. Mr. Hampden Gurney has so lately gone to his rest, bearing with him an unwonted measure of esteem and affection, that we should shrink from speaking slightly of a legacy bequeathed by him to the Church at whose altars he served. Whilst at other times we might freely criticise the defects of his writings, which always remind us of the players who acted Hamlet with the omission of Hamlet's part, at the present season we would rather be silent, than wound the heart of any amongst his sorrowing friends. Nevertheless, the critic's duty must be performed, painful as may be the task. Its irksomeness, however, is greatly relieved, when we find that, after all, this is no legacy bequeathed by the author, but some sermons, never intended for publication, which were found by the Dean of Canterbury amongst Mr. Gurney's papers. If they had professed to be an exposition of the Acts, we must have found grievous fault with the omission of all reference to things which the Apostles treated as most important in the constitution of the Church; but, as it is, they are only chance sermons on moral subjects, and their only connection with the Acts happens to be that their texts are taken from that Book. To call them "Sermons on the Acts," if it be a fraud upon the public, is a fault for which not Mr. Gurney, but Dean Alford, is responsible. And we fear from the Dean's own sermon on the same Book, which we noticed at the time of its publication, that he has never penetrated at all beneath the surface of this portion of Holy Scripture.

There is a total absence throughout of all reference to the authority of the Church. The Apostles, whose acts are recorded, are treated as ordinary Christians, whose biographies were written, like those of other good men, for the edification of those who come after. We open the book and find an assertion in the very first page that there was no necessity for our LORD's sojourn on earth during the forty days which followed the resurrection, but that His ascension was only delayed out of kindly feeling towards the Apostles, that their faith in His resurrection might be strengthened by His frequent intercourse with them. Mention indeed is made of the delay giving the SAVIOUR time "to teach the Apostles much of His will;" but as we read on, we find no reference to the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, the rule of the Church of CHRIST on earth, the unfolding of the principles of which was the great work of this eventful period. The only teaching appears to be the same as every Christian may receive, as well since as before his LORD's ascension; for if it were not so, the

point at which the sermon aimed would have been lost upon the auditors.

From the text of the next sermon, we supposed that some of the lessons, omitted in the first, would be supplied. The text is no less than the promise which followed the Divine commission,—“Ye shall receive power after that the HOLY GHOST is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.” (Acts i. 8.) This sermon was preached on the Festival of SS. Simon and Jude; but the lesson is simply this—that, because nothing is recorded in “the Acts” of SS. Simon and Jude, Christians should be content, although their works remain without record on earth. A good and salutary lesson is this, no doubt; but very far short of that one which the text was designed to teach or what the Church deduces in her collect for the Festival. S. Jude bids us “contend earnestly for the faith.” We have been taught that belief in the holy Catholic Church which has been incorporated into the creed of our baptism is a part of that faith for which S. Jude exhorts us to contend; but Mr. Gurney tells us that this is a matter of trivial importance.

“We can afford to differ,” he says, “on many points of interpretation. Questions relating to matters of discipline and Church-government let men settle according to their light. We have no sympathy with that bigotry which turns human opinions into Articles of Belief, and proscribes and excommunicates all sects and churches, save that which adopts to a nicety its own Shibboleth.”—P. 33.

Next follows a sermon on the healing of the lame man, which is very ingeniously converted into a panegyric on Luther. We might have passed it by as a sample of Mr. Gurney’s ingenuity, if we had not found in it a denial of the Sacraments as means of grace, and of the institution of Christian priests as dispensers of God’s grace through the Sacraments, which they are commissioned to deliver to the people. “Who was it,” asks Mr. Gurney, in reference to Luther, “who proclaimed aloud the almost forgotten truths of man’s personal responsibility before God; of his justification *by means of his own faith; of grace, given, not to the Pastor to be dispensed among the flock, but to every individual sinner to be used on his own behalf.*” For what purpose, we inquire, did Mr. Gurney minister the Sacraments to his people? He is no longer amongst us to answer, but the Dean of Canterbury is responsible for giving to the world hasty expressions which his friend had no opportunity of revising.

The sermon on the hypocrite’s doom appears to us unsatisfactory.

“It was not a common lie. There was profaneness about it as well as deceit. The Church was just set up. Men, taught by the HOLY
VOL. XXV. R

GHOST, and armed with miraculous powers to attest their mission, ruled it in CHRIST'S name. Among other things in this time of necessity, they were the almoners of the household of faith, and uprightness and fair dealing was due from every brother to help them in the work of distribution. To play false at such a season, to break the family compact for private gain, to covet the reputation of unstinted liberality, and to keep back cunningly what might minister to self-indulgence, was a sin against the Divine economy, and implied forgetfulness of that searching Eye, which watched the newborn Church at every step of her perilous course."—P. 83.

We, on the other hand, think it was a *common lie*, one acted far too commonly in our own days. It was the sacrilege of making a vow to God and keeping back part of the price. God's signal judgment testified His abhorrence of it in the Church's early days, that the warning might be handed down to future ages, in which the sin of Ananias would be continually reacted. This it is which leads men to seek relief by Acts of Parliament from the responsibilities of the priesthood, which causes so many to withhold from God a life once devoted to His service, and which tempts them to think that He will be satisfied with a less unreserved self-sacrifice than that which in earlier days they resolved to make. In the Apostles' days it was necessary to teach by such a signal judgment, that, terrible as were those weapons with which the world threatened to extinguish the infant Church, God's arm was yet more terrible, and that no man having put his hand to the plough and looking back was fit for the kingdom of Heaven.

We regret that Mr. Gurney could not speak of S. Stephen's martyrdom without a sneer at the fuller details of later martyrologies. It is illogical to assert that because no miracles were wrought at S. Stephen's death, none accompanied any other martyrdom. If all are to be denied, the denial must rest on some surer proof than this; but a miracle was really worked at S. Stephen's death, although its effects were not immediately seen, and this was the conversion of S. Paul in answer to the martyr's prayer. The purpose for which SS. Peter and John went down to Samaria is mis-stated. Mr. Gurney says, "A good work was begun, which was presently reported at Jerusalem, and brought down Peter and John to help and direct it." S. Luke, however, tells us, that the Apostles went down to confirm those whom S. Philip, who was not a Bishop, had baptized. The narrative of the Ethiopian eunuch is curiously strained into an argument (if it means anything) against the necessity of preaching.

"'How can I,' was the answer, 'except some man should guide me?' a very favourite text with the Romanists. The Bible is worth nothing, they tell us, without the Church to interpret it; useless, or even mischievous, unless a Priest stands by the reader's side, and says,

'The words mean this ; so you must understand them, and no otherwise.' Now the cases do not seem quite parallel between a Bible-taught Christian, knowing in the letter the whole counsel of God, having for his own, word for word and letter for letter, precisely the same message from God, as the Priest, or the Bishop, or the Pope, neither less nor more ; and a half-taught Gentile in early days, who had got a scrap of prophetic writings, and was trying to puzzle out their meaning without ever having heard of Him of Whom the Prophet certified."—P. 132.

If the Church of Rome has erred in depreciating the private study of Holy Scripture, Mr. Gurney in avoiding Scylla has fallen upon Charybdis. We think, however, that, if he had had opportunity of reperusing his sermon, he would have pruned his words, when he saw that his arguments tended to prove the utter uselessness of his own expositions.

A whole sermon is devoted to the visit of Ananias to S. Paul at Damascus ; but no mention is made of the real purpose for which he came. There is not a word respecting baptism ; but the interview is treated as a chance meeting between a doubting inquirer and a matured Christian, who was appointed in God's Providence to speak words of peace and consolation to his brother, and who disappears from the scene as soon as his purpose is accomplished. The admission of the Gentiles into the Christian covenant is another instance of the manner in Mr. Gurney uses the narratives of "the Acts," to teach lessons which they were never intended to convey.

"Very prevalent," says Mr. Gurney, "has been the habit of practically excommunicating all who are not of our Church ; and grievously have Christian men, up to our own day, been sinning against charity, because the Apostolic text has been completely lost sight of, 'God gave unto them the like gift as He did unto us, who believed on the LORD JESUS CHRIST.' Men have been proscribed who were taught the spirit of holiness, guided into all saving truth, enriched with many excellent gifts, made fruitful in good works, because in matters of Church order, which are very slightly touched upon in Holy Scripture, they felt free to depart from established usage, and found what seemed to them a more excellent way of presenting their offerings to God."—P. 209.

The followers of every schism and every heresy might make the same claim ; but until it can be shown that the Gentile converts existed in a separate communion from those who were of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, the formal recognition of the reality of the conversion of Cornelius can never be an excuse for departure from the doctrine or fellowship of the Church.

Another passage we extract respecting the lesson to be derived

from the fact of Paul's labouring with his own hands, that he might not be chargeable to the Ephesians.

"It may reasonably be questioned whether in our ecclesiastical arrangements we have not run too far from Apostolic practice,—whether the broad line of demarcation which the Romish Church for her own corrupt purposes drew between Priests and people, be not continued as a traditional thing among ourselves, so as to fetter our freedom of action and hinder some works of practical usefulness. The Apostle, it seems, could both preach and labour. He thought it no disparagement to his high office to cut, and shape, and stitch, like his friends Aquila and Priscilla. He did not apprehend that his message would be held cheaper one day, because he had worked industriously at a worldly calling on the preceding day. If the teacher may thus cross the line and become a worker, may not the worker too cross the line and become a teacher? Who shall forbid him, in the spirit of Christian humility and Christian charity, to tell his neighbour what he knows?"—P. 279.

This appears to us plainly contrary to the whole teaching of the Church. We read of the Divine Commission given and fulfilled, of all things done decently and in order, of regular ordinations and a total absence of that confusion which Mr. Gurney so unhappily excuses. We do not know what interpretation would be given to the text, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" or to the fact of the Apostles ordaining elders in every city; but Mr. Gurney's ingenuity is very extensive, and therefore we expect he would explain these things away in some very specious manner.

It is an ungrateful task to expose the errors of "the Sermons on the Acts" without speaking of their excellencies. They are written in a picturesque and lucid style, which, added to the fervour of the preacher's manner, would be sufficient to render them popular. Moreover there is throughout a very earnest denunciation of that low standard of morality and zeal which is so prevalent in the present day. Besides those which we have mentioned, their chief fault is that they are wholly subjective: whilst objective truths, if not denied, are simply ignored; and this silence, common, as it unhappily is in the popular teaching of the age, we believe to be equivalent to the propagation of erroneous views. If men are taught that they may be independent of the means of grace, that questions of Church-order and discipline,—even of the very existence of the Church at all,—are to be classed amongst things indifferent, the Sacraments will soon be disregarded, and men will choose teachers for themselves, in place of those whom the ordinance of CHRIST has provided for them.

Simultaneously with the appearance of Mr. Gurney's Posthumous Sermons, we welcome the publication of a little book of very unpretending form, which occupies the second place at the head of this article. The usefulness of this little book must not be estimated in relation to its size. It contains in brief outline, but in

very distinct clearness, the chief features of the teaching of "the Acts." It forms a portion of a series of Expositions which are in course of publication by Mr. Masters, and the Lectures it contains were originally, we understand, delivered to his congregation by a well-known Clergyman whose long continued witness for the Church's faith, through evil and through good report, has been marked by that patient, yet untiring zeal, which must ever in the end command success. These were taken down in shorthand at the time of their delivery, and, having been afterwards revised by the Author, are now given to the public. If they had been written with the express purpose of counteracting the evil tendency of Mr. Gurney's Sermons, they could not have been more explicit; but yet they are all the more valuable as possessing an independent origin.

We believe with the Author of the Exposition, that it has been a common mistake to suppose that the Gospel dispensation was distinguished from the Mosaic, amongst other things, by the comparative absence of system in the former; and that this idea has originated from a comparison of the first three Gospels with the books of Exodus and Leviticus. The truth is that they are not capable of comparison, because it is "the Acts" and not the Gospels which under the later dispensation occupy the parallel place to the Levitical Books. In making known the Christian system, a different method was used, but one which was not the less systematic. The directions of the Law itself were given to the Israelites of old; whilst the Christian polity is made known to us by all the actions of the Apostles reflecting their light on the declaration with which the Book, which records them, opens—"that Jesus was seen of them forty days, speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." The difference of methods well accorded with the difference of dispensations. The Acts of the Apostles were to be reacted in all times, for their commission was to last until the end of the world, and therefore there was less need of incorporating in written laws things which were to be patent facts, ever present in the Church; whilst the enactments of the Mosaic Ritual were to pass away and be succeeded by better things, and therefore it was necessary that they should be recorded in more precise language, that we, to whom they are no longer living things, might better understand them and learn the doctrines which they enshrined.

According to this method the forty days were but a preparation, and the real history of the Church begins with the Ascension of our LORD. Although the Apostolic Commission had been given, the Apostolic functions were not to be discharged until the SAVIOUR had left the earth. He did not ascend because all that He could do for man was accomplished, but He returned to Heaven for as definite a purpose, as that for which He had before descended. He came to earth to be our Redeemer, and He returned to Heaven to be

our Great High Priest. Henceforth His Apostles were to supply His place on earth. "As the FATHER," He said, "hath sent Me, so send I you." The same office which He filled in Heaven was to be exercised by them in His Name on earth. If He was the Great High Priest, that designation implied that He must have inferior Priests under Him. S. Paul declares that the function of a Priest is "*to offer gifts and sacrifice for sin.*" The continued sacrifice which the SAVIOUR, as our Intercessor, presented in Heaven, was likewise to be perpetuated on earth by the exercise of the Priest's office, whose actions were so to mingle with those of the Great High Priest above, that Heaven and earth should be linked together, and the vision of Jacob be realized in very deed.

The first act of the Apostles illustrates the importance in which they held their office; for what did they do as soon as they had returned to Jerusalem after their LORD was ascended? They went and made one of their own friends a priest, because their number was incomplete in consequence of the sin and death of Judas. Not only was the perpetual succession therein implied, but also the absolute necessity of the priesthood before anything else could be done. The Church was to be the Body of which CHRIST was the head, but the position assigned to His ministers was as the arms, without which the body is powerless to act. It is CHRIST, the head, who directs and orders what is to be done; whilst His earthly agents do but carry His will into execution.

And now when the Apostles had again filled up their number, they waited until the day of Pentecost. They did not first go and preach, but they tarried until the HOLY SPIRIT had descended, because their mission was not to preach only, but to impart spiritual gifts. The HOLY GHOST was to be the great motive power by which all things should be accomplished; and we may observe how entirely the minds of the Apostles dwelt on this whenever they spoke of their Apostolic functions. "Repent," said S. Peter in his first sermon, "and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins, *and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.*" Again S. Paul did not ask the Ephesians, "Have ye been confirmed?" but "*Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?*" Confirmation is always spoken of as the gift of the HOLY GHOST. SS. Peter and John for instance went down to Samaria and laid their hands on the disciples who had been baptized by S. Philip, "*and they received the Holy Ghost.*" In the consecration of SS. Paul and Barnabas, the HOLY SPIRIT is distinctly spoken of both as director and agent. "The HOLY GHOST said, Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. So they being *sent forth by the Holy Ghost* departed unto Seleucia." Thus also S. Paul directs the clergy of the Church of Ephesus to "*feed the Church of God over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.*" The synodical action of the Church is again distinctly

referred to the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT, for the Apostles did not scruple thus to speak of the determination at which they arrived: "*It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.*" In baptism, confirmation, ordination, and consecration, as well as in the synodical action of the Church, the power of the HOLY GHOST was confessed to be called into exercise; and these functions were spoken of rather as the operations of the Eternal Spirit, than, as we are accustomed to speak of them, the acts of CHRIST's ministers.

The absence of any direct mention in the Acts of the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT in the Eucharist is accounted for by the reserve of the Early Christians, who esteemed it too sacred a mystery to be much spoken of or written about; but the ancient liturgies will supply that information respecting which S. Luke is so guardedly silent. In all of these, without exception, a distinct form is provided for the invocation of the HOLY SPIRIT. In these liturgies, still used in the Eastern Church, there is always a prayer to the effect "that God would send down the HOLY GHOST to sanctify the gifts lying on the altar, and to make them the Body and Blood of the LORD." Although the invocation is omitted in the Western liturgies, which are of more recent date, no denial of the doctrine can be inferred from the omission, as we believe that, with the exception of Dean Ramsay, all orthodox divines have ever maintained the doctrine. The discussion is with respect to the place which the invocation ought to occupy, and not to the propriety of its retention.

By the laying on of hands, which in every instance was a symbol of the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT, a new order was added to the Church in the appointment of the seven deacons, and now the organization of the Church was complete. Whether the first institution of the order is recorded in the sixth chapter, or whether this was only an addition of Greek deacons, as their names seem to imply, to a certain number already ordained, there is no question but that the deacons were not appointed until after our LORD's Ascension. Whilst the SAVIOUR was on earth, the order of His ministry was threefold. There was Himself the High Priest, the Apostles, and the seventy, who were sent forth with authority under them. This answered to the polity of the Jewish Church in which a threefold order was appointed, consisting of High Priest, Priests, and Levites; but when our LORD had left the earth and deputed the supervision of His Church to others, the deacons were appointed that the number three might be again filled up. Some difficulty arises from the want of precision with which S. Luke speaks of the different ranks of CHRIST's ministers; but when the allusions to them are examined, they will be found to be in effect but three, as the ancient Fathers and the whole history of the Church bear witness. The Irvingites speak of a fourfold ministry, founding their argument on Eph. iv. 11. but it is a sufficient an-

swer to their argument to say that if it were valid, they would be compelled to admit five orders. It is the number and not the names that we must insist on, because the names employed were taken from the polity already existing in the Jewish Church, and it was only by degrees that the new sense became fixed. Another cause for this ambiguity was that the lower offices of the Church were contained in the higher. Thus a Bishop might officiate either as a Priest or as a Deacon; whilst Priests were restrained from Episcopal acts, and Deacons as well from Priestly as Episcopal functions. This will account for the assertion which has been made of the equality of Bishops and Priests, "*quoad sacramentum*," which has entered into recent controversies, and been ably handled by the venerable Bishop of Exeter. The Acts of the Apostles gives us examples of ordination to these three orders. Bishops, i. 26; Priests, xiv. 23; Deacons, vi. 6. These were the human hands, by which the Divine Head of the Church has ever distributed spiritual benefits to His people, a threefold order which may be a perpetuated image and symbol in its paternal, filial, and fraternal relations, of the Trinity in heaven; "a supposition," says Archer Butler, "which may appear less fanciful when we remember in what peril the great doctrine of the FATHER and the SON has ever been of corruption or extinction in almost every religious community, where the Apostolic polity has been rejected."

The observance of the LORD'S Day and of holy seasons, Easter and Pentecost at least, is also fully proved from the Acts, xx. 7, 16, xii. 5. The early Christians continued in the Apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. The doctrine spoken of was that contained in S. Peter's first sermon which embraces almost seriatim the articles of the Apostles' Creed. The fellowship implied, not only that inward communion which exists between the several members of CHRIST'S body, and specially between priest and people, but the outward expression of charity shown in almsgiving, which soon resolved itself into the weekly offertory, a subject which Mr. Tweed has ably handled in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford. The breaking of bread already finds its place as the highest act of Christian worship, taking precedence of prayer. How often the Eucharist was celebrated is a question which has of late been much debated. Mr. Freeman has argued in favour of a weekly celebration only, but there certainly are considerations which appear to weigh in the balance against his argument. The ritual of the Mosaic law was an exact type of Christian worship. Under this there was a daily sacrifice, and therefore we may infer that the great Christian sacrifice was not intended to be offered up less frequently. In Jerusalem there certainly appears to have been a daily celebration (ii. 46); and although the first day of the week is especially mentioned as the day on which the Christians at Troas came toge-

ther to break bread, yet it appears as if there was an early celebration on the following morning. It was on the first day of the week that S. Paul preached till midnight. It was at midnight that Eutychus fell from the window; and after his restoration we read that the "Apostle broke bread, and continued speaking till day-break." The rule of the English Church is not well defined, but the writer of the Exposition argues that, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the rule of the times preceding the Reformation must have been intended to be continued. Then undoubtedly there was a daily celebration, and although the English Church has only provided services in the Prayer Book for Sundays and Holy Days, directing that at other times the Sunday service shall be used throughout the week, yet this again is only in strict accordance with the ancient custom.

The prayers in which the first Christians continued were public prayers, prayers offered in the temple at the appointed hours, at one of which SS. Peter and John were entering in when they met the lame man. The Levitical Law had only provided a twofold daily sacrifice, and the practice of observing certain hours of public prayer was an imitation of later growth. In our LORD's time it was a recognized custom and part of the established worship of the people. The idea of common worship thus appears to have been part of the Jewish system. "Jews are required," says Dr. M'Caul, "to attend the service of the synagogue every day, because the prayers of individuals are not always heard, but the prayer of the Church is always accepted." Out of the Jewish grew the Christian ritual, the Christians using the temple services as long as opportunities allowed, and then assembling themselves together, as the SAVIOUR had instructed them, in His Name, an expression taken from the custom of inaugurating all formal meetings in the name of the Supreme Authority. Thus the Christian services naturally grew out of the Jewish, with such additions as the change of dispensations required. This is the origin of the order of morning and evening prayer appointed to be observed daily throughout the year, wherein the SAVIOUR's promise is fulfilled, that where two or three are gathered in His Name, He will be present in the midst.

We have not space to follow the author of the "Exposition," in his delineation of the growth and extension of the Church, a subject, which, in these days of missionary enterprise, is of more than ordinary interest, but we cannot conclude without some reference to the last two lectures on the Government and Faith of the Church.

The government must be invested either in the personal authority of an individual, or else in the united authority of a limited number of men, ruling by virtue of some special prerogative. The latter form of government under the guidance of the HOLY SPIRIT was adopted in the Church as a final appeal. When the difficulty with regard to circumcision arose, "the Apostles and elders came

together for to consider the matter." The Bishop of Jerusalem, acting as president, pronounced the final decision of the united council, delivering their judgment, not as their own, but as that which seemed good to the HOLY GHOST and to them. In after times Œcumenical Councils, following the example thus given, decided differences which threatened the Church's unity. This might appear to be an inconvenient mode of settling controversies, and recourse would be had to the other alternative, an appeal to the personal authority of an individual. Three times in the course of the Church's history has this been tried, and each trial has resulted in failure—I., when Constantine was converted to Christianity, the hope was aroused that under his sway all opposition to the faith of CHRIST would die out, but the apostasy of the emperor, who succeeded his three sons, taught the Church that it was no human arm on which she might safely lean. II. Charlemagne again, who by his zeal and energy defended the Church from the oppression of the Mahomedan power, yielded to the temptation of arrogating to himself a spiritual authority, and the Church yielded to his usurpation; but the danger quickly passed away, for God taught the Church, by the dispersion of the power of Charlemagne, after his death, that the authority of the HOLY GHOST acting through Christian councils, was not to be transferred to any human instrument. III. Three centuries later the temptation was revived in a more subtle form, and this resulted in the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome of that spiritual power which had before been confined to General Councils of the Church. The issue of that usurpation may be seen in the severance of the Eastern from the Western Church, and in those lamentable divisions which now rend the unity of CHRIST's Church in Europe. From the Acts of the Apostles we may therefore learn to avoid the two errors of Erastianism and a Papacy.

The history of the Church bears witness that the ecclesiastical polity, first brought into action at Jerusalem, was sufficient for the preservation of the Faith. The decree of the Apostolic Council was at once promulgated in a formal epistle, and then we read of SS. Paul and Silas going through the cities of Asia Minor, "delivering the decrees which were ordained of the Apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem," and the result is stated in these striking words, "So were the Churches established in the Faith, and increased in number daily." And when in after days the same power was called into exercise, the result was still the same. The most memorable instance of this was the establishment of the Catholic Faith at the Council of Nicæa, when Arianism threatened to overwhelm the Church; yet in spite of all human improbability, the orthodox faith was established, and the Nicene Creed has ever since been a part of the Church's heritage. The Council of Constantinople witnesses to the same truth; and doubtless, if in God's

providence a General Council were again permitted to meet under the guidance of the HOLY SPIRIT, we should "rejoice for the consolation," as did the Christians at Antioch in the Apostles' days. One important deduction we must not omit, and that is that the rule of faith established by General Councils comes to us on authority, not only the authority of the Fathers of the Church, who were assembled to take part in them, but on that of the HOLY GHOST, Who conducted their deliberations to their final issue.

And now in conclusion, we must repeat our desire that a plain commentary on the Acts of the Apostles should be in the hands of the people, since that book not only unfolds the Divine origin of the Church's polity, but it concerns us as nearly as the records of the SAVIOUR's life; for it is the Gospel of the Comforter Who was promised to supply the presence of our LORD on earth, when He was taken up from amongst us to fulfil on our behalf the functions of His Eternal Priesthood in Heaven.

SHUTTE'S LIFE OF THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

The Life, Times, and Writings of the Right Reverend Dr. H. Phillpotts, Lord Bishop of Exeter. By the Rev. R. N. SHUTTE, B.A., Rector of S. Mary Steps, Exeter. Vol. I. London: Saunders and Otley. 1862.

CONTEMPORARY biography ought to be either *bond fide* autobiography, or written under the superintendence and with the material assistance of the person who is the subject of the narrative. Mr. Shutte's work partakes of neither of these characters. It is not only not composed by the Bishop of Exeter himself, but is published in direct contravention of his wishes, and has even given rise to legal proceedings, having for their object to restrain the writer from printing certain private letters of Bishop Phillpotts, which had fallen into his possession. Into the question of right which is here involved we do not profess to enter, nor yet into the more delicate one of what is due from a Priest to his Diocesan. Our business is with the book, and not with its author. Mr. Shutte gives two reasons for writing the Bishop's life; not that he professes to be qualified for the task by intimate acquaintance, or by the possession of materials which have not fallen into others' way, but that he was asked by the publishers to prepare the work, and that if he had not undertaken it, somebody else would have done so. We may be permitted, however, to express a mild surprise, that, if Mr. Shutte thought it worth while to declare his reasons for

engaging in the work, he did not furnish himself with a better argument than the schoolboy's plea of "Please, sir, Brown told me to do it." Owing to the circumstances under which it was undertaken, the interest of the book is materially diminished. The writer was obliged to confine himself to Dr. Phillpotts' public life, and we miss accordingly those little traits of character, those domestic and personal circumstances, those chance sayings and doings of social life, which place the man palpably before the reader, and which give one of its chief charms to biography. What are the weighty considerations to which Mr. Shutte mysteriously refers, (p. 14,) which render it expedient that the Life should appear while the Bishop is still among us, we will not attempt to divine. But in so far as they have occasioned imperfections in the work, and loss of definiteness in the portrait of the *man*, as distinct from the pamphleteer, the debater, and the Bishop, we can only regret their existence, and trust that the writer may be enabled to be a little more graphic in his delineation of character before the publication of his second volume.

The story of the Bishop's public life, as far as the second year of his episcopate, is ably told in the pages before us; and though the interest of the strife of parties and the political antagonism in which he was long engaged, has passed away, and minute criticism upon such events is rather tiresome and ineffective, yet a knowledge of his antecedents, and a notice of the steps by which so eminent a person attained to his present position, can never be otherwise than interesting, and we shall therefore offer no apology to our readers for here sketching briefly the salient points in the Bishop's life, as far as his biographer at present takes us.

The town of Bridgwater, Somersetshire, was the birthplace of Henry Phillpotts. He was born here on May 6, 1778. His father was a brickmaker, a trade still carried on in the outskirts of the borough, to the great discomfort of the inhabitants. Four years later his father removed to Gloucester, where he established himself as landlord of the "Bell" inn, in which house, it is noticed, nearly fifty years earlier, the celebrated George Whitfield first saw the light. The future Bishop received his first instruction in the cathedral school, exhibiting no great talents or originality, but obtaining the reputation of a steady, industrious boy. From this school he was removed to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, at the early age of thirteen years. Having taken his B.A. degree in 1795, he was soon elected a Probationer Fellow of Magdalene College, and had the further honour of gaining the University prize for the English Essay, the subject being "The influence of a religious principle." It was here that he obtained the friendship of Dr. Routh, at that time, and for very many years afterwards, the respected and learned President of his College. At the same time he also became intimate with Dr. Coplestone, Provost of

Oriel, and subsequently Bishop of Llandaff. To these friends he owed the peculiar bent of his mind, and the direction of his studies to theological subjects and accurate logical analysis. In the first year of the present century he was appointed Reader in Moral Philosophy, and soon after one of the first Examiners for University honours. At the age of twenty-four Henry Phillpotts finally made up his mind to enter the ministry of the Church. He was ordained Deacon by Dr. John Randolph, Bishop of Oxford; in 1804 he was admitted to the Priesthood by the then Bishop of Chester, resigning his Fellowship in the same year on his marriage with Miss Surtees, a niece of Lady Eldon, who was herself a daughter of Aubone Surtees, Esq., of Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Those were the good old days of pluralities, when the best of Churchmen did not scruple to undertake the spiritual charge of widely separate parishes, and it was not thought unbecoming in a priest to be constantly changing his benefices, in order to better his position or to please his patron. Mr. Phillpotts' conduct formed no exception to this almost universal custom. His first benefice, to which he was presented in the first year of his priesthood, was the vicarage of Kilmersdon, near Bath. This however he held but two years, without ever having resided at it. The same thing was repeated in the case of Stainton-le-Street, Durham, to which he was presented early in the year 1805. Meantime he had been offered, but had refused, the Principalship of Hertford College, Oxford. His learning and ability had by this time attracted much attention, and in 1806, Dr. Shute Barrington, the Bishop of Durham, appointed him chaplain, and he rapidly received benefice after benefice,—the livings of Bishop Middleham, and Gateshead, prebendal stalls in the cathedral, and a chapelry in the city of Durham, and finally the rich rectory of Stanhope, succeeding each other with remarkable regularity. These appointments were not all held at the same time, but enough were retained to provide a very sufficient income for one who had no private means, and to prove that his merit was very generally recognized.

Of Mr. Phillpotts' literary labours the earliest was a series of controversial letters in defence of a Charge of the Bishop of Durham, on "The grounds on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome," which had been warmly attacked by an anonymous Roman Catholic writer, generally supposed to have been Dr. Lingard. Mr. Phillpotts was not long content with the quiet round of his professional duties. His active mind, strongly pronounced opinions, and logical training, urged him to speak out whenever he saw an abuse in Church and State which needed correction. His industrious attendance to his magisterial duties (for, as we ought to have mentioned, he had been appointed a justice of the peace in 1806, while vicar of Bishop Middleham,) had qualified him to speak with authority on the existing state of the Poor Laws;

and when a proposal was made in Parliament to remedy some of their proposed defects, he addressed a letter to Mr. Sturges Bourne, the principal advocate of the new measures, in which he quietly and argumentatively showed the insufficiency of the proposed remedies from his point of view, and the merits of the existing system when worked in a charitable and liberal spirit. His next pamphlet was more worthy of his subsequent reputation in controversial writing. It was a letter, signed by "A Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham," and addressed to Lord Grey, the subject being that nobleman's motion for repealing the Test Act. To thorough acquaintance with the whole question, and strongly marked convictions, Mr. Phillpotts added a dialectic skill and a natural aptitude for seizing upon an opponent's weak points, which proved that he was a most valuable friend and a most dangerous enemy, and wielded a pen which it was wiser to conciliate than to provoke.

In animadverting upon the Earl's bad theology, the "Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham," it must be admitted, does not rise very much above the Protestant views prevalent fifty years ago, as where he speaks of irreconcilable differences between the Romanist doctrines touching justification, good works, the sacrifice of CHRIST, and His mediation, and those of the English Church upon the same subjects. It had been the aim of Earl Grey and his party to represent the Churches as entirely agreed except upon trifling points; and this view doubtless had the effect of driving the writer to the opposite course of magnifying the real difference; but it was seeking for these in a wrong quarter, when the pamphleteer fastened upon verbal distinctions instead of confining his argument to those fundamental articles for the maintenance of which Rome enforces the decisions which all true Catholics deplore. Incidentally in the pamphlet a careful account is given of the scheme for reconciling the Anglican and Gallican Churches, formed by Archbishop Wake. This is quoted in full by Mr. Shutte, (pp. 34—36) and will well repay perusal.

A more celebrated controversy on the Roman question is that which he undertook with Mr. Charles Butler for his opponent. His fifteen letters in answer to that gentleman's work "The Book of the Roman Catholic Church," are models of dignified and courteous polemical writings. The unanswerable arguments which they contain are put forward with a quiet weight and a studied regard to his opponent's reasoning, which leave nothing to be desired, and which will constitute them a most valuable repository of knowledge for all time. If, following Mr. Shutte's guidance, we take exception to the statement concerning the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in the twelfth letter, it is with unfeigned regret that we do so, and with the assured belief that in after years the opinion alluded to was considerably modified, and that the true objective Presence of CHRIST is now as firmly

held by the Bishop of Exeter as by any among our readers. The unprincipled attempts of Roman Catholic controversialists to explain away and soften the doctrines of their Church which were most repugnant to the Protestant mind, evoked further correspondence with Mr. Charles Butler, and in a supplemental letter the sophistries of Drs. Kelly and Murray, and other Roman Catholic dignitaries, were well exposed, their evasions and disingenuous assertions ruthlessly handled, and the Romish system was conclusively shown to be one and the same under all circumstances, however convenient it might at times be found to conceal existing tenets, or to modify existing practices. Such a masterly *exposé* of controversial tactics has seldom been seen; and it is not often that a Prelate of any Church has received a worthier castigation, or made a sorrier figure, than was the fate of Dr. Doyle, when he fell under the pitiless lash of Dr. Phillpotts' logical analysis and historical knowledge.

Into the question of Roman Catholic emancipation Mr. Shutte has entered at some length, and with great clearness. The concession has now been granted for many years, has worked, as all far-sighted politicians saw that it would work, and has brought with it certain developments which could not logically be refused, however inexpedient and destructive they may really be. But there is a question connected with the part taken by Dr. Phillpotts, which needs to be stated and answered carefully, as his consistency and motives have alike been called in question. There can be no doubt that he was resolutely opposed to granting the claims of the Romanists, as originally put forth; there is no less certainty that in after years he both sided with and wrote in behalf of the promoters of emancipation. How are these apparent contradictions to be reconciled? In the famous letters to Mr. Canning upon this subject, the first of which appeared in 1827, Dr. Phillpotts most expressly states that he was induced to enter upon the discussion, not only to vindicate certain doctrines of the English Church from the misrepresentations of the Papal party, but also because he considered it a duty to remind the nation, that it was now proposed to abandon that system of securities, without which it hitherto had never been contemplated to grant the desired concessions. He then proceeds to say elsewhere, that the time of exclusion was gone by, that some measure of comprehension was indispensable, and that nothing remained but to provide securities which should be as stringent as possible. In a letter to Lord Eldon he put forth a plan of his own, which while virtually admitting the Romanists to a share in the legislature, without specifying them by name, required from them a *proviso* to the effect that they would do nothing against the Church of England and Ireland, this Church being reckoned "a fundamental and essential part of the Constitution." From this it will be seen that the

charge of tergiversation is ungrounded, and that the conduct of Dr. Phillpotts in retaining his confidence in Peel, when Oxford rejected him for his share in passing the Bill of relief, was the legitimate result of his matured conviction, and not, as was hastily and maliciously assumed, the conversion of an ambitious cleric to the winning and prize-giving side. We need not pursue this subject further, as it can have now little interest for our readers: rather let us offer a few specimens of the Bishop's skill in defending himself, and in retorting upon unscrupulous adversaries.

Like many other wise and good men, who are true to the principles of the Church, and who think for themselves, instead of taking for granted the conditions vented by so-called liberals and latitudinarians, Mr. Phillpotts early roused the animosity of the *Edinburgh Review*. The immediate occasion of the attack first made upon him by this publication was the issue of a "Letter to the Freeholders of the County of Durham," in defence of the course which he and others had taken, by publishing a declaration with regard to some Reform riots at Manchester. The article was entitled "Necessity of Parliamentary Inquiry," and was conceived with all the malice and misrepresentation for which that Review has attained an unenviable notoriety. It provoked a triumphant answer, in which the reviewer's mistakes and prejudices are unmercifully exposed.

"One extract," says Mr. Shutte, "may be commended to the attention of *liberals* of every shade.

"To say the truth, this is not the first time that I have had occasion to admire the exquisite felicity with which the lovers of free discussion and manly inquiry can adjust their graduated scale of crimes and punishments. All who profess the same 'liberal sentiments' as themselves, are at once invested with an undefined and undefinable privilege. These 'chartered libertines' may say what they please, abuse whom they please and how they please—they may run to the extreme verge of legal endurance, and even occasionally overstep into the confines of slander or sedition. At the worst it is only a generous indiscretion—while the first person who asks them, why do ye so? has the whole fraternity let loose upon him, unless he cuts and squares his diction to the nice pattern which suits their self-complacency."—P. 57.

A second violent attack was made by the same periodical in November, 1822, in an article headed, "Durham Case—Clerical Abuses," in which Dr. Phillpotts was mentioned by name and subjected to most unwarrantable abuse. The "Case" referred to the conduct of the Durham clergy upon the return of Queen Caroline to England. They had thought fit not to join in an address prepared at a county meeting, which had used the queen's misfortunes as an engine to drive the king to displace the existing ministry. The clergy prepared a counter-address, which rather

sided with the government, and pointed out the real grievances and dangers of the times. Another meeting was held at Morpeth, wherein the conduct of the Durham clergy was severely censured, and Earl Grey was especially animated in his strictures upon their proceedings. The speech of this nobleman called forth a letter from Dr. Phillpotts in justification of the course they had taken, and in rebuke of the spirit in which they had been calumniated and vilified. Upon this a local newspaper, the *Durham Chronicle*, took up the cause, and in violent language abused the clergy for their "brutal enmity" to the queen, because they had not caused the bells to be tolled at her death. The publisher of this paper, one Williams, was tried for libel, and though defended by Mr. Brougham with "terrible" eloquence, was convicted and punished. It was then that the *Edinburgh Review* took part in the quarrel. Dr. Phillpotts describes the article as written "by some inferior hand, who, without the slightest pretensions to the strength of the serpent, can only exhibit the slime and the venom." He replied to it in a letter to Francis Jeffrey, the reputed editor. After exhibiting the reviewer's ignorance of history and theology, exposing his subtleties and falsehoods, and showing the late proceedings of the clergy in their true light, he concludes with some crushing remarks upon the manner in which the *Review* generally was conducted.

"If by inadvertence any thing false, unjust, or culpably offensive to the feelings of an individual, should for once have crept into his journal, at least he would be anxious to prevent all recurrence of the injury. Has such been the conduct of the editor of this review? An article was published in his sixty-fourth number, reflecting in the coarsest terms on my character. I answered that article by proving the wilful falsehood of its main allegations, and at the same time called on the author to defend his own veracity. Under that challenge he sat down in silence. He seized indeed (or some one for him) on some subordinate particular, and with much confidence of manner, and fresh scurrility of language, triumphed over my supposed misapprehension of a point of law. Here, too, he was defeated; his ignorance of the law was exposed, as his less venial practices had been detected before. Having done this, I addressed the editor of the review in terms of forbearance, perhaps I might say of courtesy, on the just grounds of complaint which I might urge against himself. After an interval of three years, being again assailed in the same journal, with equal grossness, and as I have proved, with equal falsehood, I now tell the editor before the world, that on him will light all the ignominy of this second outrage; I tell him, too, that he would rather have foregone half the profits of his unhallowed trade, than have dared to launch against any one of his brethren of the Gown, the smallest part of that scurrility, which he has had no scruple in circulating against churchmen. To you, sir, I make no apology for addressing you on this occasion. If you are not, what the public voice proclaims you to be, the editor of the review, you will

thank me for thus giving you an opportunity publicly to disclaim the degrading title. If you are, it is henceforth to me a matter of indifference what such a person may think or say."—Pp. 85, 86.

One more extract will show the vigour of the pen wielded by Dr. Phillpotts.

"The editor's own feelings on this occasion may perhaps give him some lasting touches of remorse for more than twenty long and guilty years of wanton or wilful disregard of the feelings of others. Let him, in his present mood, look on the catalogue of honourable and distinguished names, which he and his confederates have laboured to make the sport or the victims of their spleen, their arrogance, or their party fury. Let him reflect on the meanness, as well as the injustice, of abusing the power, which the extensive circulation of his journal gave him to 'blazon those names' in every quarter to which English literature could reach, 'in connection with epithets' scarcely less painful (except that they were, for the most part, unmerited) than those, under which he now writes, with the bitter consciousness that they are deserved. Let him remember, that, during so long a period, he has by himself, or his minions, pandered to all the envious and malignant feelings of his readers, used every engine of literary torture that could wound and lacerate ingenuous minds—left unessayed no single gradation of cruelty, from ruffian violence down to the subtler and safer expedients of mock candour and contemptuous commendation—to establish a despotism of the pen, which, like other despotisms, has ended in destroying itself. Let him read in the indignation, or the pity, of every impartial mind, his own large share in the common ignominy which has long been thickening round his band—and then, let him, if he will, affect to hide his shame under the babyish plea, that he did not load the piece, he only primed it and drew the trigger—that he has, in short, only hired himself out to a bookseller, for some stated hundreds of miserable pelf, to be the midwife and the nurse to every unfathered brood of calumnies which the malice of his faction shall engender. If he will, let him talk thus, and persist to defend what he knows is indefensible. But rather, let him seek, in this, his day of deep humiliation, the real benefit which he ought to draw from it. Let him meditate on the painful contrast of what he is, and what he might have been—and what he yet may be. And then let him cast off at once the vile slough with which he is encumbered—again stand forth in some ingenuous form, and vindicate anew his title to that high respect, of which no man but himself could rob him. Let him do this, and he will yet have reason to rejoice that in one, whom he had doomed for his victim, he has found a monitor and a friend."—Pp. 88, 89.

On the promotion of Dr. Coplestone to the see of Llandaff, the deanery of Chester was conferred upon Dr. Phillpotts, in 1828, in recognition of the part which he had taken on the Roman Catholic question. This preferment he held till his removal to Exeter three years later.

Of the history of Dr. Phillpotts' life up to the end of the second year of his episcopate there is little more to be said. He had been offered by Lord Liverpool the see of Clogher, but had refused it, in the expectation, Mr. Shutte affirms, p. 90, of higher dignity in England, and in consideration of some (improbable) promise made to Bishop Barrington, but doubtless from the reason that all his friends, his literary pursuits, and his affections were connected with England, and that he was loath to sever the ties which bound him to this country. In the close of the year 1830, the Duke of Wellington nominated him as successor to Dr. Bethell in the see of Exeter, which he accepted on the condition that as the income of that bishopric was small, he should be allowed to hold the Rectory of Stanhope *in commendam*. This stipulation was very severely criticised, and excited so much ill-feeling that it had to be surrendered, and a compromise was effected, by which a Canon of Durham was appointed to Stanhope, and the Bishop received the vacant canonry, which he has continued to hold till the present day.¹ The review of his life and actions as Bishop will be better left for a future occasion when further volumes of the work are before us.

In conclusion, we may well thank Mr. Shutte for a very readable and valuable compilation, and if he will take a word of advice, give us longer chapters and shorter headings, cultivate brevity of detail somewhat more, and refrain from sly exhibitions of soreness and ill-temper, (as in Pp. 11, 14, 25, 29, 48, &c.) he may claim to have written a biography which displays worthily and effectively the public life of a very celebrated man.

THE INDELIBILITY OF ORDERS.

THE indelibility of orders may be considered in three ways—

1. As a matter of social convenience.
2. As a rule of Canon Law.
3. As a theological necessity.

It is the first of these which of course is the most practical as a popular argument. The House of Commons could scarcely now be expected to view the question in any other light than that of general expediency. The battle has to be fought in this case, as in so many others, upon grounds external to the fortress which has to be defended. The Canon Law implies a state of society, and

¹ If the Bishop was not before his generation on the question of holding preferment, he has at least gone beyond it in the way in which he is appropriating what has fallen to his share—witness his endowment of the Theological College, and the noble gift of his library.

the theological argument implies a belief in mysteries which the councils of our land no longer recognise.

Doubtless many will join with us from arguments of social expediency who would differ from us altogether upon those other higher grounds. We have here only an instance of what is very common. The ordinances of God and the well-being of society are so linked together, that persons who repudiate the Divine authority accept the Divine command. The social-system and the Catholic Faith come from one Author, so that those who would retain the blessings of the natural world are driven to accept the ordinances of the supernatural.

Nor only so. In this, as in many other cases, there is a latent faith in earnest minds, the quickening principle of their religious life, which they shrink from embodying in words. There are many who are more logical in heart than in head; and the love of God which quickens their heart leads them to intuitions of Divine Truth, which fear or prejudice forbids their acknowledging as a system. They will accept the conclusion as a holy rule, while they put away the dogmatic premises which alone can make the rule a real one.

Happily, then, we have with us many supporters of the indelibility of our orders who would be quite incompetent to consider it as a theological question, and would scarcely give a patient hearing to the enunciations of Ecclesiastical Law.

In our January number we said something of the matter in its more general aspects. We proceed now to look at it from the doctrinal side.

The indelibility of orders is of course universally recognized; but in what way the Canon Law regulated the social consequences of that indelible character we cannot determine. By many Canons we find that Bishops and Priests, for certain crimes, are to be reduced to lay Communion; but how far they might live as other laymen while continuing within the communion of the Church, we do not know. For we must remember, this is the practical issue of the dogmatic assertion: the reason why we are anxious to ascertain the reality of an indelible character is because we want to know how far a clergyman who has cast aside his professional duties may return to the world and take up with secular employments. We are not concerned now with any doubt as to re-ordination, but with a doubt as to how far a clergyman degraded should be eligible for admission into other professions.

The reason, probably, why the Canon Law fails to guide us here is, that the separation of professions is a growth of much more recent times. Clergymen might hold most secular appointments, and therefore, *à fortiori*, degraded clergymen might do so. Time was when the priesthood were really the men of the world—perhaps those most truly the leading men of the world who were the

least worldly in their spirit. When the contemplative and scholastic divine was the man of science also and the statesman, and when there was more than one Right Rev. general extant in the field, the incongruity of secular appointments with the sacerdotal character still latent in degraded ecclesiastics would scarcely be noticeable.

Probably the Church has both gained and lost by letting go the reins of temporal influence, in order that priestly hands may be the more reserved for priestly functions. The dissolution of the monastic orders probably made it the more necessary that the secular clergy should be enclosed by rules of professional etiquette. When society had a strong faith in the priestly character, these accidental indications of its existence were not wanted; when society no longer believes in a priest as essentially different from any other man, it becomes necessary to stave off the inroads of unbelief by traditional customs. When, again, new circumstances arise, and those traditional customs fail us, it becomes necessary for us the more clearly to assure ourselves what the reality is for which we have to contend—a reality which perhaps we have been too apt to lose sight of amidst the earthworks of traditional custom by which the enemy were kept off. So we have in the history of this doctrine four eras.

1. The Apostolical—the aggressive era: when the reality of the priestly character was felt in all its divine power and achieved a victory over a world which ignored it.

2. The era of the Church's secular triumph; when the truth was acknowledged on all sides: but the spiritual obligations of the truth were too much forgotten amidst the intoxication of temporal influence.

3. The withdrawal of the mind of the nations from the acknowledgment of the truth; followed by a developement of secular energies in mere laymen, the world setting the Church gradually aside, and bidding her be content with her own concerns.

4. The resumption by the world of the same attitude towards the Church as was found in the Apostles' days—utterly ignoring that the Church has any real concerns of her own—utterly ignoring therefore her divine character by which she has to handle those spiritual matters, and reducing her to a department of state for the moral wellbeing of our present society.

As we are now entering upon this fourth stage—which we cannot doubt is in fulfilment of the prophesied apostasy—it becomes very necessary that we should have as lively, as real a faith in our own character as the Apostles had.

Whatever excommunications the Church might fulminate against seceding ecclesiastics, they can have no physical effect unless the state is ready to back up the Church's authority, and we must be content, we think, to get as much help as we can from the expe-

diency-class of statesmen. On the other hand ; if the denunciations of the Church are to have any moral effect, it must be because they issue forth as the logical expression of deeply rooted convictions of theological necessity. If a seceding priest who secularizes himself is to be scouted as unworthy of Christian fellowship, it, must be because his life is a sin not against a class wearing a professional dress, but a sacrilege and sin against a real but mysterious something, inherent in himself, which is the divine mark upon him and the perpetual protest against his abandonment of previous obligations.

That this indelible character was always recognized as a doctrine is certain, although we find continual canons deposing clergy from their outward ranks or order in the Church.

Bingham says : " By some canons he is said to be degraded, deprived, and turned out of office ; by others to be totally deposed, *παντελῶς καθαιρεῖσθαι* ; totally to fall from his orders or degree—*παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμοῦ*—to be deordained or unordained, to be removed out of the order of the clergy ; to cease to be of the number of the clergy, and to be reduced to lay communion, that is, to the state and quality and condition of laymen."

In this last statement Bingham appears to fall into a fallacy through an equivocal use of the word order. It may express the outward position accorded to the clergy, or the inward character which that outward position did but recognize. The degraded priest fell from the one. He could not in the minds of the ancients forfeit the other.

Bingham professes to maintain the indelibility of orders, but really reduces the thing to an absurdity. Not recognizing the distinction between power and jurisdiction in the priesthood, he makes the indelibility of a priest's orders to be nothing more than a necessary accident—a phase of his historical individuality. So an arch-deaconry would be indelible, or a premiership, or the heathenism of one converted late in life. He adopts, exaggerates, and unintentionally caricatures by an illustration the teaching of Forbes in his *Irenicum* :

" As if a prince should imprint upon his nobles the marks and characters of the offices which they bare under him, making the impress or figure of a key upon the arm of his chamberlain with a hot iron, and the image of a horse upon the arm of the master of his horse, and the image of a cup upon the arm of his butler ; and after this it should happen that the prince being justly offended at them should depose them from their offices and put others in their room, signing them with the same characters. These marks, which in the officers who were not deposed, were characters of their present power would, in those that were deposed, be only footsteps of their by-past power, and whatever thing they who were deposed should do relating to those offices would have no more validity than if it was done by any private man who never bare

such office. Yet in this there would be a difference, that if the prince pleased to restore those whom he had deposed there would be no need to set a new mark upon them, but that footstep or remains of their ancient power would now become again the character of their present power.”

This parable, which is doubtless intended to make the sense of the ancients very plain, seems really to make against the writer rather than for him. For surely if in any country the bearers of an office had to bear the brand of a red hot iron as the mark of their authoritative action, the brand-mark would have to be effaced when they quitted office; or they would always be able to act in virtue of that authoritative sign. If the bodily brand were anything more than a freak of the Prince's fancy, a seeming evidence of induction into office, it would carry power as long as it lasted—a power which the wearer might have no right to exercise, but which others could not help acknowledging.

This is what the Church has certainly always taught,—that the soul of the ordained is stamped with a character empowering for the performance of certain Divine actions. Even though jurisdiction, or lawful permission to exercise the power may be withdrawn.

Now the ancients, however strongly they discouraged for the most part a resumption of office by those who had been degraded, nevertheless admitted penitents back without re-ordination if they ever were reconciled; and from this the Schoolmen rightly argued not that the power was nothing because it was for a time incapable of legitimate exercise, but that the power was permanent because it did not need to be given a second time.

And so in like manner we find the doctrine of an indelible character expressly taught by S. Augustine, although the technical word did not come into use until afterwards.

Van Espen writes:—

“Quapropter Augustinus dum frequenter urget ipsam indelebilitatem Baptismi ipsum Baptismum neque per schisma neque per apostasiam amitti; licet nomine characteris non utatur, tamen idem quod nomine characteris significatum voluit postmodum Ecclesia, sufficienter expressit, atque signanter lib. i. de Baptismo contra Donatistas cap. i. apud Gratian. Can. 40, Dist. 4, de Consecratione dicens, ‘Nullus autem illorum neget habere Baptismum etiam Apostatas quibus redeuntibus et per pœnitentiam conversis dum non redditur amitti non potuisse judicatur. Sic et illi qui per sacrilegium schismatis ab ecclesiæ communione discedunt habent utique Baptismum quem priusquam discederent acceperant. Nam et ipse si redeant non eis iterum datur. Unde ostenditur illud quod acceperunt in unitate positi non potuisse amittere ab unitate separati.’”

It was thus believed that in Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, a real spiritual gift was made over once for all, the exercise of

which might be permanently prohibited by the proper ecclesiastical tribunals, but the reality of which the power of God alone could undo; although in the case of Orders it was considered doubtful whether it was a character of such a kind as to continue in another world, like Baptism and Confirmation, the purpose of its existence being not individual sanctification, but ministerial agency.

We may thus look now to Holy Scripture to see what is the primary meaning of character as applied to Baptism.

It is the gift of a new nature in addition to our former nature. We are not only renewed by the HOLY GHOST, but we are regenerate, that is, born again into a new life; or, as S. Peter says, being made "partakers of the Divine Nature." It is the gift of the HOLY GHOST to us, as being engrafted into the Body of CHRIST, which constitutes our Baptismal Character.

It is a further gift of the HOLY GHOST, by which we are sealed in Confirmation. The word "seal" supplies us with the first trace of the doctrine of a character, as expressive of the soul's supernaturally communicated faculties.

CHRIST is the image or character¹ of the FATHER's glory. CHRIST is formed in us as we grow in grace and spiritual power. The character which we receive in Baptism, Confirmation, Orders, is the character of CHRIST, our High Priest, the power to join with Him in the work of His mediatorial kingdom. Grace is necessary for the healthy exercise of this character—these supernatural powers of Christian life, in union with CHRIST; but the grace and the power are distinct. Grace may be lost; but the character is a supernatural faculty, stamped on the soul for all eternity by the power of the HOLY GHOST.

Grace is in the soul as a gift from God, possessing its own excellence, uninjured by the evil wherein it dwells,—healing the evil; but if it be not used, it is withdrawn.

Character is an instrumental virtue engendered within the soul,—a faculty capable of being used for good or for evil, according to the correspondence of the minister or instrument with CHRIST, the efficient cause of its operations.

It is therefore a form which the soul assumes, by the fact of union with CHRIST. It is not merely an outward thing that may be put on or off, according to our inclination, to carry out CHRIST's work or otherwise. It is a real power for effecting a real work—viz. the bringing mankind within the sphere of CHRIST's mediatorial intercession.

If we meditate upon its reality, we shall understand the necessity of being at all times and in all places outwardly,—as we are thus for ever inwardly,—separated from the ways of mankind unto the Gospel of CHRIST.

Our Baptism, our Confirmation, and our Priestly Orders have

¹ Hebrews i. 3.

conveyed to us an indelible character, each intensifying the work of the former; because the HOLY GHOST, calling us into the participation of the Divine life, fitted us for communion with God; and that fitness which belongs to us as the temples of the HOLY GHOST we do not lose, although the sanctifying presence of the HOLY GHOST be withdrawn through our sin. As the traces of animal life remain imprinted on the rock-side, so the soul, which has been regenerate, retains for ever the tokens of the indwelling of the HOLY GHOST, whereby it was fashioned after the likeness of CHRIST by union with His glorified Body, although it become hardened in the death of sin.

Sacramental character is therefore defined as being *quædam participatio sacerdotii Christi in fidelibus Ejus*. The reality of this character consists in the possession of certain powers for communion with God.

The powers may be either passive or active.

Passive powers are those by which we are capable of receiving Divine gifts; so that an unregenerate person, although he receives the "sacramentum," or outward sign in the LORD'S Supper, has no capacity for receiving the "res sacramenti," which being of a spiritual nature, requires a spiritual nature in the recipient. And as passive powers are necessary for our individual reception of the graces of CHRIST'S priesthood, so active powers are necessary for us to communicate the graces of that mediation to others.

This further character, therefore, is what we receive at our ordination, and it is conveyed by the power of the HOLY GHOST. "Receive ye the HOLY GHOST" were the original words of ordination by CHRIST, and the words by which we were ordained. The reality of this reception, as something additional to what we possessed before, consists in the communication of powers to do certain acts of priesthood in union with CHRIST our great Mediator.

Now if we look to the ordination of the Apostles, we shall find that the priestly acts of the Apostolical ministry are two.

First, the charge was given them, "Do this in remembrance of Me;" to offer the Eucharistic memorial of CHRIST before God; to set Him forth as the sacrifice upon earth, even as He presents Himself as the Lamb slain upon the altar of His Heavenly Throne.

The *second* priestly power which they received was the power of forgiving sins on earth, as CHRIST had forgiven sins during His personal ministry. It was by the inspiration of the HOLY GHOST breathed upon them from the lips of our LORD that they were to cleanse and loose the penitent from the stains and bonds of sin.

The two great powers then in which, as far as Holy Scripture teaches us, the priestly character consists, are the powers of consecrating the Eucharistic elements to be the Body and Blood of CHRIST and the power of absolution.

These powers though conveyed by Apostolical ordination are real

powers inherent in the individual. The Church has power to regulate their exercise, but not to withdraw them. They are not a mere outward official decoration, but an organic developement of the Body of CHRIST. Until the individual is finally cut off from that Body these powers must remain as much as his natural powers of mind or body.

If we have not these powers, our priesthood is throughout a mere name: instead of being the joints and sinews of the Body of the New Man, we are only in the weakness of our old nature. But if these powers are real, then our priesthood is indelible. We may sin against it by neglect of its obligations, by forgetfulness of its perpetual requirements, by doubting its sufficiency to enable us to carry out the ministry of the New Testament.

But we *are* ministers not of the letter, but of the spirit. God has not given us the spirit of fear but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind. "That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the HOLY GHOST which dwelleth in us," writes S. Paul to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

In such language as this does Holy Scripture bid us remember the reality of the character which belongs to us by this communicated power of the HOLY GHOST; and that that character is given to us in real union with CHRIST the High Priest of our profession is expressly told us by S. Paul when he says, "For your sakes for-gave I it *in the person* of CHRIST."

A priest then who retires into lay communion cannot lay aside the powers which belong to his position in the Body of CHRIST, unless he become separate from that Body altogether. The powers of the priesthood are the spiritual faculties which are communicated to individuals from CHRIST for the edification of His Body, cleansing His members from sin, and feeding them with His glorified Flesh and Blood, and interceding on their behalf by the virtue of His Sacrifice on Calvary. This ministry, although communicated through men, is not received of man, nor by man, but of the HOLY GHOST in the Body of JESUS CHRIST. Nor can it be laid aside by the will of man, nor taken away by the authority of man. The unfaithful priest who turns to the things of the world from the mysteries of God, must wait for his final excision at the last day.

A word as to Deacons. It would not be said, according to the ancient theology, that they received character, although from the days of S. Ignatius their office was habitually joined in "the three-fold cord" with those of Bishop and Priest. It happens however remarkably that the English Canons have shut the door against their escape beyond what has been done, so far as we know, in any other branch of the Church. The 76th Canon of 1603 runs thus, "No man being admitted a Deacon or Minister (i.e., Priest) shall

from thenceforth voluntarily relinquish the same, nor afterwards use himself in the course of his life as a layman, upon pain of excommunication. And the names of all such men so forsaking their calling, the churchwarden of the parish where they dwell shall present to the Bishop of the Diocese, or to the Ordinary of the place will having Episcopal jurisdiction." So that even Deacons, we fear, not be in a condition to accept Mr. Bouverie's proffered "relief."

DR. M'CAUL'S EXAMINATION OF BP. COLENZO'S DIFFICULTIES.

An Examination of Bp. Colenso's Difficulties with regard to the Pentateuch. By the Rev. ALEXANDER M'CAUL, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London. Rivingtons.

A CAVIL may be contained in an epigram or a sentence, which it may require many pages to answer. We confess therefore that we rather trembled when we observed the small proportions of Dr. M'Caul's reply. Our fears however subsided as we turned over page after page, and we can confidently say that Dr. M'Caul has been very successful in his answers to the Bishop's objections. In justice to the writer we give one or two as examples.

Chapter II. is on "The Family of Judah." This difficulty brought forward by Bp. Colenso, is one not even discovered by modern criticism, but it was observed and explained centuries ago by Christian Fathers, and Jewish Rabbis. It is concerning the age of Judah, and the birthplace of his grandchildren, Hezron and Hamul. The difficulty, argues Dr. M'Caul, is based upon two suppositions of the Bishop's, viz., that the historian meant to convey the idea that Hezron and Hamul were born in Canaan, and that Judah was forty-two years of age at the descent into Egypt; and therefore, according to certain calculations by the Bishop, there arises some doubt about Judah's being a grandfather *then*, which he must have been if Hezron and Hamul were born. Thus the Bishop sees a discrepancy between these two statements. He repeats the words several times, "All the souls that came *with Jacob* (the italics are the Author's) *into Egypt*, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, were threescore and six," (Gen. xlv. 26,) which they would not have been without Hezron and Hamul. "And the sons of Joseph which were born unto him in Egypt, were two souls—all the souls of the house of Jacob which came *into Egypt* were threescore and ten." (v. 27.) "These are the names of the children of Israel which *came into Egypt*;

every man and his household *came with Jacob*, and all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob, were seventy souls; for Joseph was in Egypt already."

Now all these quotations serve only to refute the author's view. The only one which seems to favour it is Gen. xvi. 26, "All the souls that came *with Jacob* into Egypt, which came out of his loins, were threescore and six." But this is only favourable in the English translation, for the whole stress of the argument lies upon the preposition "*with*," which preposition does not exist at all in the Hebrew; but a word signifying "to, of, belonging to," as the following verse explains, "All the souls of the *house* of Jacob." The great object of the sacred historian seems to have been to prove that the total number who went down into Egypt was seventy, therefore verses 26 and 27 ought to be read together.

The Bishop will say that the preposition "*with*" is expressed in Hebrew in Exodus i. 1, where it is written, "Every man and his household came *with Jacob*." But there the names of those who had households (which Hezron and Hamul had not) are given, and they are those of the eleven sons of Jacob. The grandchildren are not mentioned, nor the number sixty-six—but seventy, which includes Joseph and his sons, who certainly did not accompany Jacob into Egypt. It is nowhere asserted in Scripture that the sixty-six were alive at the time of Jacob's going down into Egypt. The words "*came*," or "*went down*" have a wide significance, as may be proved; for in Deut. x. 22 we find it said, "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons." This number cannot be made out without Joseph's sons Ephraim and Manasseh, who never, according to our sense of the word, *came* or *went down* into Egypt, but were born there. Thus this ground of the Bishop's argument is removed, for as this text proves that the words "*came into Egypt*" may include those born there, and that they do include Joseph's sons, so therefore they may also include Hezron and Hamul.

It may be asked further, in what sense those who were born in Egypt can be said to have come into Egypt. The author himself answers this question, showing that Scripture predicates of the children what is strictly true only of the parents;—as Bishop Patrick says, "speaking of parents and children as one person: and the Bishop relates, for instance, how God said, "I will go down with thee into Egypt, and I will surely bring thee up again," a promise fulfilled in the bringing up of Jacob's children at the Exodus.

To give another specimen, (chap. 10,) Bishop Colenso finds great difficulties with regard to the institution of the Passover. On these grounds he thinks it impossible, that "in one single day the whole population of Israel, as large as that of London, was instructed to keep the Passover, and actually kept it." He calcu-

lates, that the people with their flocks must have occupied a space of at least thirty-five square miles, and that they could not even hear of the command in so short a time, much less carry it into effect. "To suppose, for argument's sake," says Dr. M'Caul, "that the Bishop's assumptions are true, that the command was given and the Passover celebrated on one and the same day, and admitting that the people were scattered over Goshen, and that Goshen was equal even to sixty square miles, there would be no impossibility;" and then he shows that their descendants in Poland had a method of transmitting information from Rabbi to Rabbi in a few hours over a larger space of country than Goshen. The Bishop then states, that "it was impossible that they could have the necessary number of lambs, as that would require a flock of two millions of sheep, and that again would require four hundred thousand acres of pasturage." To this Dr. M'Caul answers, from the testimony of modern writers, that there must have been much more than four hundred thousand acres of pasturage, so this difficulty is removed. And with regard to the other calculation respecting the number of lambs required, allowing one lamb to every ten persons, our author replies, "According to the Mishna, the law was satisfied by each person eating a morsel of the size of an olive. Now a lamb of a year old could easily be cut into fifty or a hundred such pieces. If the companies of ten required two hundred thousand lambs, companies of fifty would require only forty thousand; and companies of one hundred only twenty thousand." Thus proving that all the Bishop's calculations about the number of acres requisite to feed so many sheep, and of sheep to produce so large a number of lambs, "are arithmetic thrown away."

All the difficulties supposed to exist in this chapter, however, are proved to spring from one great error of the Bishop's, viz. that the command to keep the Passover was not given till the day on which it was to be kept, an assumption, showing his ignorance of the Hebrew idiom respecting the pronouns "this" and "that." In Levit. xvi. 30, the English version has, "For on *that* day," &c., the English idiom requires "that;" but in the Hebrew it is, "For on *this* day," and yet the reference is not to the day on which the Lord speaks, but to that of which He is speaking. But a most conclusive answer may be gathered even from the English version, for "the direction to choose a lamb on the tenth day," necessarily presupposes that it was given before the tenth day, and therefore the Bishop himself says, "It is true that the story, as it now stands, with the directions about 'taking the lamb on the tenth day,' and 'keeping it until the fourteenth,' are perplexing and contradictory;" that is, they annihilate his whole theory and objections.

These are just specimens of the way in which Dr. M'Caul deals with each separate objection of the Bishop's.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Sisterhoods in the Church of England ; with Notices of some Charitable Sisterhoods in the Roman Church. By MARGARET GOODMAN, Author of "Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy." Smith and Elder.

THE present Dean of Cape Town once began a sermon on scandal and tale-bearing with the somewhat startling sentence, "My brethren, it is *not* needful for us always to tell the truth," and after a pause, he said, "I do not mean that we may tell a lie," and so on. Assuming that Miss Goodman is entirely free on the point of the latter sentence, we wish she had well considered the maxim set down in the former. Supposing all that she here brings before us to be true and unexaggerated, then we ask, Was it needful to tell it? Was it needful *so* to tell it, to tell of the long series of grievances and abuses said to exist in one particular sisterhood only, in a work, the title of which is on *Sisterhoods in the Church of England*? To tell us minutely of the want of common sense, care for the food, clothing, and recreation of one set of Sisters only, and to tell us literally nothing, or as little as possible of all the other Sisterhoods where all these things were kindly cared for and thought of, which it would have been easy to learn—this is far worse than an open abuse of such institutions at large. The office of censor is not one to be envied, let the subject be what it may, and we do not indeed envy one who has done that work in the spirit of Miss Goodman. Every good human institution, and every good man has, no doubt, faults, the more apparent from their very goodness, but how the existence of these could afford to any religious woman a plea for exposing them as here to the free and ribald criticism of our daily and weekly papers and others, we are unable to conceive.

If Miss Goodman had only told us what she had seen or heard, or what somebody who had seen or heard had told her, we should say nothing further on this work; but it is not so. Again, if from its whole tone we conclude that Miss Goodman has shown a want of religious feeling, there are parts, and those not a few, in which she has shown a most lamentable want of religious knowledge. We are prepared for her scoffing at "obedience to the Church of England," when she asks what it means, and tells us that "the Roman Catholic with a visible head knows of course, but what do we poor Anglicans mean? The Archbishop, the Court of Arches, or the Privy Council?" and that she should so read Mr. Fox's "Monks and Monasteries" as to make him responsible for the state of domestic relationships in the middle ages. But we hardly expected to hear her test the loyalty of Mr. Sewell to the English Reformation and the English Church by his sentiments about the Reformation on the Continent. It would have taken but a small amount of reading surely to have discovered that the two Reformations differed *toto cælo*, and that while the one has for the most part sunk lower and lower towards Socinianism, the other has in it the principle of Divine truth and life, to which, among other things, we are indebted for the revival of Sister-

hoods among us. We cannot imagine why "Rodolph the Voyager" is singled out: and we should have thought Mr. Sewell, in her view, a particularly safe person. Her criticism on the "worshipping of angels" in that book is simply abominable. She acknowledges that Rodolph is told *not* to pray to angels, and yet declares, p. 74, that "the volume is calculated to lead to their invocation." This is really too bad. Holy Scripture has its "See thou do it not," and the office of angels is throughout most highly spoken of. Does the Sacred Volume then encourage the practice? These are but a few of the instances in which conceit and ignorance are combined in this book. Miss Goodman has been convicted of falsehood in calling herself a *Sister*: her work is certainly full of spite, and we cannot but fear that with its praise of Romish Sisterhoods, and just enough Anti-Roman twaddle to blind John Bull, it has a deeper and more subtle object and intention than appears to the casual reader.

Sermons on the Grace of God, and other Cognate Subjects. By the Bishop of BRECHIN. London: Masters.

WE do not know whether the Bishop of Brechin will accept what we are about to say as a compliment or the reverse. We state it simply as a fact. In perusing sermons in his previous volumes we have failed to derive that satisfaction which arises from the contemplation of any of man's works, whether small or great, that bear the impress of completeness—as a poem, or picture, or other work of art. A sermon, we are aware, is not a theological treatise; and there is much to be said for leaving your readers with appetites unsated. Yet still we maintain that every sermon should have an end, as well as a beginning and middle, and should carry with it the mark of elaboration and finish. These signs are far more visible in the volume before us than in any of its predecessors. The powers of its author are now advancing towards maturity—as we trust that this maturity of his well-informed and sagacious mind may ere long be expended on some subject of adequate importance. Moreover, most of these sermons have been written under a vivid realization of the dishonour done to our LORD by the sceptical theories concerning the Atonement which have been recently put forth. The first sermon on "The Sufficiency of Grace" is a very able condensation of Augustinian doctrine; and the second follows worthily in the same track, bringing strongly out to view the Priesthood of CHRIST. We prefer, however, to quote a passage from a sermon on the well-known act of Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah:

"However, this thought by no means exhausts the reasons for the punishment of the sons of Saul. GOD everywhere speaks in the old Law in a voice hinting to us the tremendous mysteries of that kingdom of CHRIST in which we serve. S. Paul distinctly regards the circumstances of the children of Israel's life in the wilderness as types of the two great Christian Sacraments, and interprets the domestic life of the father of the faithful in the sense of an allegory of the freedom of the Gospel.

"Now, the punishment of Rizpah's sons illustrates to us the awful truth of the objective nature of human guilt. This runs through the Mosaic Law, in

common with primitive systems of human legislation. That law assumes that, independently of the criminality of the guilty person, there is incurred an objective guilt in every crime; for while evil in itself is a mere privation, evil when embodied in crime assumes a substantive existence. The Holy Scripture makes us quite familiar with the idea of a 'land being defiled with blood,' and lying under a liability to punishment till the guilt be done away. This runs through the law of Moses: it is nowhere so prominently stated as in the dealings of the neighbouring town in the case of the unknown murdered man. 'If one be found slain in the land which the LORD thy GOD giveth thee to possess it, lying in the field, and it be not known who hath slain him: then thy elders and thy judges shall come forth, and they shall measure unto the cities which are round about him that is slain: and it shall be, that the city which is next unto the slain man, even the elders of that city shall take an heifer, which hath not been wrought with, and which hath not drawn in the yoke; and the elders of that city shall bring down the heifer unto a rough valley, which is neither eared nor sown, and shall strike off the heifer's neck there in the valley: and the priests the sons of Levi shall come near; for them the LORD thy GOD hath chosen to minister unto Him, and to bless in the Name of the LORD; and by their word shall every controversy and every stroke be tried: and all the elders of that city, that are next unto the slain man, shall wash their hands over the heifer that is beheaded in the valley: and they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, O LORD, unto Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto Thy people of Israel's charge. And the blood shall be forgiven them. So shalt thou put away the guilt of innocent blood from among you, when thou shalt do that which is right in the sight of the LORD.'

"Now you will begin to see what I am aiming at when I say that this incident shadows forth the mysteries of the Gospel. It familiarises our minds with the idea of a perfectly vicarious punishment, but a vicarious punishment in which the debt is paid by those of the same race and stock with the original offender. A vicarious punishment is allowed, but not *any* vicarious victim is accepted. The punishment is due for Saul and his bloody house, and it is of the bloody house that the victims are taken, and hung up unto the LORD. Does this not at once shadow forth to us the tremendous doctrine of the Atonement, in which a vicarious punishment has been exacted, in which the Just has died for the unjust, but in which the Victim took not on Him the nature of angels, but took on Him flesh of the seed of Abraham, assumed the humanity which He came to redeem and save, and by virtue of that humanity became the Perpetual Victim, offered once for all in a bloody manner on the Altar of the Cross, carried into the Heaven of heavens, and laid upon the Celestial Altar as the Lamb that was slain, and mystically immolated, in image, on every Altar of the Church on earth.

"I am well aware that many shallow, discontented views are in circulation on this blessed subject. Nay, I have no doubt that this sacred doctrine has been preached in a dry and technical way, and a sort of debtor and creditor account of sin and its punishment been assumed to be opened between the Creator and the sinful work of His Hands. I believe that this holy truth has been pressed beyond the analogy of the faith, till it has obscured the many other aspects of the glorious results of GOD having called the world from the rising up of the sun to the going down of the same, by the Incarnation of His Blessed SON; but still it cannot be denied that the doctrine is true. There is no gainsaying such texts as, 'The Just hath been given for the unjust;' 'We have been redeemed, not with the corruptible price of silver and gold, but with the precious Blood of CHRIST, as of a Lamb without spot;' 'Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.' There is no gainsaying these clear words of the most eminent prelate who ever occu-

pied the chair of Canterbury :—‘ On whom should He (the LORD CHRIST) more consistently bestow the fruit and recompense of His own death, than on those, for the sake of saving whom He became man, and to whom by dying He set an example of dying for righteousness’ sake ; for in vain will they be followers of Him if they are not followers of His merits ? Or whom may He make more justly inheritors of what is due to Him, and to the superabundance of His fulness, than His own relations and brethren, whom He sees encumbered by so many and such heavy debts, pining away with want in the depth of misery ; so that what they owe for their sins may be forgiven them, and that of which they stand in need be bestowed ? ’—Pp. 65—69.

Essays on Liturgiology and Church History. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. London : Saunders and Otley.

THIS is just a book that it is impossible to review, because, we suppose, it consists itself of Reviews. It is culled chiefly from the pages of the “ Christian Remembrancer ; ” but we are proud also ourselves to have had a share in their production. They are Essays, we may safely say, that no man in England besides Dr. Neale could have written, and they are certainly well deserving the more permanent shape which is here given to them. Those on the Breviary and the Liturgy will ever be found most valuable introductions to that branch of study. The book is beautifully printed in Elzevir type, and on tinted paper. A running title to each article on the top of the left-hand page would have greatly facilitated reference. We hope that the volume will find its way into our standard libraries.

Dr. KENNEDY’S *Hymnologia Christiana*, (Longmans,) should be mentioned both as a literary curiosity—1500 Hymns and Metrical Psalms, edited in a scholarly manner, is no common undertaking—and as an indication that the popular taste is quite aroused to the importance of this branch of Divine worship. We have still to regret, however, that although the services of the Church-year are carefully followed, the Old Hymns which have been sung at those seasons for so many centuries are very sparingly given. The saints’ days too, most marvellous to relate, are altogether ignored. We should have thought this was bad policy.

The Kalendar of the Imitation, (Masters,) is a collection of sentences of S. Thomas à Kempis, which are intended to be read, one on each day in the year. It is not a new idea, but an English reprint of a little book published at Linz in 1630.

Mr. Masters has sent us a batch of small books suited for all tastes. *Willie Morgan*, and *We all do fade as a Leaf*, are of the didactic order. *The Everlasting Hills*, an allegory, and *Little Nelly*, a story of country parish life, are quite equal to the average of this kind of literature. *Harold : a Ghost Story, with a Moral*, shows a good deal of power in the writer, and with *George Turner, the London Apprentice*, a story of the beginning of the present century, is likely to exercise a good influence on boys.

What is the Church? by the Rev. HENRY DALTON, (Bosworth and Harrison, London,) is a very ingenious exposition of the Irvingite theory. With the first part of the pamphlet, which treats simply of the Church as the new creation, we can of course fully concur, despite the ungraciousness with which he misinterprets what he terms the "High Church" view of her position; but when he diverges into the founder's assumptions, which have called his sect into being in the last thirty years, we can but regret, as we have ever done with regard to all who hold his opinions, that those who maintain the truth up to a certain point, so justly and so nobly, should pervert it by pretensions which they well know if untrue must be blasphemous.

The Duty of a Christian in the disposal of his Income, (Bosworth and Harrison, London,) shows plainly and practically the obligations of all in this respect; and at the same time treats the matter with sufficient indulgence to bring the counsels within the reach of those who scarcely aim at self-sacrifice.

It is a new phase of the increased attention given to Hymnology to find Mr. C. B. PEARSON translating some of our more popular English Hymns into Latin, (Bell and Daldy.) The success of the translation is scarcely uniform, but sometimes we seem to be quite reading a Mediæval strain. Bishop Ken's Morning Hymn turns into excellent stanzas. Thus:

"Ades Tu? sedes beatas
Jam adire videor;
Abes? inter exsulatas
Animas dejicior.

"Supplex adsum; Tu delicta,
Roris instar, discute;
Munda animam ac dicta,
In cor meum deflue."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me to seek through your pages, the clearing up of a small practical question? In the *Churchman's Diary*, at the foot of page 11, there appears, and it has so appeared I think for many years, the following note: "The fast of a vigil ends with the first vespers of the festival, i.e. about 4 p.m." The practice in which I have been brought up, taught on the other hand, that the obligation to fast on a vigil, lasted, as on all other fast days, from midnight until midnight, notwithstanding the intervention of evensong of the festival. This is a question of fact, I suppose, on which a lawyer ought to be able to set one right. Perhaps one of your readers may help us.

I am, sir, your most obedient servant,
X. Y. Z.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

THE doctrine of Justification is that great central verity of the Gospel, which, more than all others, has been marred, and, as one may say, eviscerated by modern controversy. It is really a synonym for the entire salvation which is by CHRIST; for without Justification we cannot be saved; and when a man is really justified there is nothing else at that moment wanting for his salvation. Such is Justification as S. Paul defines it; whereas what Luther and Calvin turned it into, and the bodies of Protestants who are named after or follow one or other of them, is simply a most unreal shibboleth of unsound theology and of rancorous party spirit.

Let us be content then to go back *ad antiquos fontes* to the teaching of S. Paul, and to the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who accepted his writings in their integrity.

The Apostle, in his grand Epistle to the Church of Rome, which stands first among his writings, not as being the earliest Epistle in point of date—for such it was not—nor yet simply nor chiefly as being addressed to the Church which had its local habitation in the mighty Metropolis of the world, but because it furnishes the key wherewith to unlock the mystery of the Gospel—describes at length what were the great necessities of the human race, and the method which it pleased God to adopt for the purpose of extricating it from the lost condition into which it had fallen.

The awfulness of that condition is pictured at the opening of the Epistle in colours of the deepest dye. The Gentile world, which boasted itself in a system of philosophy for which it was thought no problems of science or of morals were too hard, had nevertheless reached a state in which their eyes were blinded, and even that sense of right and wrong which natural religion furnishes had been distorted and depraved: they had become “disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful.” And what was the state of the Jewish people at that time? In one sense they were immeasurably better off. To them Almighty God had made a special Revelation of Himself. They knew Him to be a Pure Spirit, holy, just, and true, not swayed, as were the deities of the heathen, by lusts and passions, which would disgrace even fallen humanity; they knew that while He was indeed merciful, He would “by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children’s children, unto the third and fourth generation.” But all this knowledge profited them naught. They failed through it to regulate their hearts and lives, and while they were sure that the judgment was according to truth against those

that committed such things as were common among the Gentiles, they yet did the same, and in some respects worse. At all events, their sin was greater, being committed against light and knowledge, and in spite of warnings manifold. For this was the universal testimony of their own Prophets against them—that they had all gone out of the way—that there was none righteous; no, not one—that the whole head was sick and the whole heart faint.

By such an undeniable process does the Apostle prove the whole race of mankind to be concluded under sin, and therefore to stand in need of some new Revelation which should show them the way out of that abyss of hopelessness into which they had fallen.

And what was it that the world needed? It was to be made just or righteous. God, we know, is Himself essentially just and holy. And His people must be made like to Him: otherwise they are not His people: not His own. We must be like Him, S. John tells us, if we would see Him as He is. How then must this likeness be produced? It must be effected now. And God alone can do it. He is Himself *Just*, and He must be the Justifier of all. It is the object and purpose of all Religion, that has ever existed, to justify man; for seeing that God is his Creator and LORD, it must needs be that man should be required to live in conformity with those rules which his Creator has imposed upon him; and it is plain that in such obedience must consist his righteousness and perfection. In this way Adam would have been justified, had he certainly believed what God had said to him, as the condition of his spiritual well-being. In this way Abraham was justified. Believing God, and the promise which He made to him, he came out from his native land, not knowing whither he went. Believing in the power of God, Who can make those things to be which are not, he waited patiently for the birth of the promised seed, and continued walking in the steps of a holy obedience. Again, believing that God must be true, and that what He commanded must be right, he stretched forth his hand at the bidding of God to slay his son—that son in whom all the promises centred. In all these three several ways was the great Father of the Faithful justified, and he became the spiritual Progenitor of a countless seed, each one of whom had to be brought into the bonds of the Covenant by the divinely appointed rite of Circumcision. This was their Justification. Every one who received the sign of Circumcision was by virtue thereof accounted righteous in God's sight. Such was the import of that institution. Further it pledged men to be holy, for, as S. Paul declares, every one that was circumcised was bound to keep the whole Law; but it possessed no power to make men holy: it did not profess to change the sinful nature of man: it had not anything expiatory in it: it simply recorded an act of mercy on the part of God, and an extension of His favour towards the person circumcised for Abraham's sake.

“What advantage then had the Jew, or what profit was there in circumcision?” So S. Paul asked the question in the person of an unbeliever, and thus he answers it in his own: “Much every way; first, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.” By those oracles they knew the will of God; but they had “not kept them.” They knew how He was to be approached, but still they drew not nigh Him, or at least not in spirit and in truth.

In this manner their very opportunities and advantages became occasions of falling to them, and sank them practically to a lower level than was that of the heathen world itself. Then it was that the Second Person in the ever-blessed Trinity “looked and saw there was none to help, and wondered that there was none to uphold; and so His own arm brought salvation to Him.” He left the heaven in which He had dwelt from all eternity, and clothing Himself in a human body,—for it was *man’s* covenant with God that had to be fulfilled; it was on the basis of His original compact with man alone that God could condescend to act,—and in that body fulfilled the two conditions on which alone the just and true God could receive back again His people that had gone astray. In His own person He kept the commandment, which Adam had failed to keep. During the thirty and three years of His sojourn upon earth, He did no sin in thought, or word, or deed, though in all points tempted like as we are. In the strength of that perfect obedience He could thus approach the FATHER and say, “Behold the terms of the covenant fulfilled to the very letter: all that Thou hast commanded I have done; a child of Adam has a right to the tree of life; death can have no claim on him; heaven has been won.”

This was as it were the first moiety of what CHRIST came to do, and it rendered Him competent to fulfil the other part also. His life was now His own, and He could do with it what He willed. What that was we all know. He laid it down a sacrifice for those whom He had graciously made His brethren. How great the value of that Sacrifice intrinsically was—the righteousness He wrought—the sufferings He endured—the life He surrendered—cannot be told by mortal pen or angel voice. It is God alone Who could truly measure its inestimable merit, and that He did not in words but by facts—by the bursting tomb, by the opening heavens, by the preached Gospel; for all these tell of justice satisfied, of offences forgiven, of God reconciled to man.

This is the good news which S. Paul in this Epistle is proclaiming to those who were as yet almost strangers to it. He declares that man, who was then under the power of sin, was “being justified,” under process of justification, i.e., as one and another were being brought to God by CHRIST, and rendered acceptable to Him; “being justified freely by His grace, through the redemp-

tion that is in CHRIST . . . by faith without the deeds of the law.”¹ These words are few, and will need therefore to be weighed each one separately.

1. And, first, it is to be noted, this work of God’s is called Justification. The etymology of the word, which belongs to a large family of words in the English language similarly compounded, is plain and undeniable. It means the making a person righteous. How is that to be effected? The answer we must give will depend upon the answer that is given a previous question, viz., What is the condition of the being who is to be the subject of this justification? Is he good, or evil, or in a neutral state—ready, that is, to receive any bias that may be given him? If the last of the three be the state or condition of man’s Being, then there would be nothing needed but to infuse good; if the first, only to infuse more good; but if the second of the three alternatives be the true state of the case, then the first thing in point of time must be the removal of the evil that is inherent and in actual possession. And this we know to be man’s natural estate. He is born in sin, and a child of wrath; and as long as that evil attaches to him, grace and goodness cannot enter. They are effectually excluded; for “into a malicious soul wisdom cannot enter.” That wrath then must be propitiated, that sin must be removed, as the first step in man’s justification.

So S. Peter says that we are baptized *for the remission of sins*; and so, the result of our being born in sin being that we are under the wrath of God, justification may rightly be said to consist in God’s *accounting* us righteous. For His Son’s sake in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism He forgives the child of sin and accounts him righteous, and then permits His grace to flow into the soul to make it righteous. Thus it is that one² of the Thirty-nine Articles gives the being accounted righteous as the synonym or equivalent of Justification, while another³ gives the infusion of the HOLY SPIRIT as its synonym. The two in fact are part of the same process—separable entirely in idea and separable more or less practically in point of time—but yet so intimately associated together, that no sooner is one done than the other commences. It is as though water were kept back out of a certain field by a barrier or dam. Remove that obstacle and the water instantly rushes in to fertilize and gladden the soil.

In this manner man is both *accounted* and *made* righteous in his Justification. In other words, Baptism to us produces a real moral change, facilitating obedience, and sowing those seeds of grace which are destined, when rightly cared for and cultivated, to ripen into a harvest of sanctity. Whereas the corresponding

¹ It is to be observed that this is the present participle—δικαιοῦμενοι. When S. Paul describes the condition of Christians, he uses the past participle—δικαιοῦθέντες.

² Article xi.

³ Article xiii.

rite of Circumcision under the law was endued with no such power—because that the Sacrifice for sin had not yet been offered ; captivity had not yet been led captive, the Spirit had not yet been poured out.

2. And so, secondly, Justification is *by Christ's free grace* : it is His gift. And it is to be observed that whenever grace is spoken of in Holy Scripture in connection with the Second (not, as generally, with the Third) Person in the HOLY TRINITY, it refers to that particular gift which is derived immediately from Himself—the gift of remission of sin.

3. For thirdly, the meritorious cause of our Justification is CHRIST. It is “by the redemption that is in CHRIST JESUS,” and more exactly and specifically by His Resurrection ; for as S. Peter affirms, “He died for our sins and rose again for our Justification.” Had CHRIST not become incarnate, died, and risen again, it is plain that Justification would have been impossible. The whole history of man was a series of fallings away from God. Witness the Deluge : witness the Captivity : witness the Destruction of Jerusalem. All these were judgments upon accumulated sin—all speak plainly of recovery being hopeless—all show that so far from redeeming his brother, men were only helping and encouraging one another to sin, and filling up the measure of their iniquity.

4. Then, next, S. Paul tells us that this Justification is imparted to us without our “doing any works of the law,” i.e., without our meriting it by our obedience. On the contrary it has been shown already that man unjustified could only sin : the Law told him what was right, but could not enable him to perform right—and so “by the Law practically was the knowledge of sin.” And this is made further plain by the circumstance that under the Gospel we receive Justification ordinarily in our infancy, before we are of age to do either right or wrong consciously. It is in Baptism that we are justified—being baptized for the remission of sin, and then as a necessary consequence on the principle laid down above, receiving the gift of the HOLY GHOST.

5. What then has man to do ? He has to come to CHRIST to avail himself of the means provided—to accept the gift—to profit by the redemption that has been wrought—to let himself be justified. Some in a Christian land do this : others stand aloof—obviously for the reason that they do not believe in the reality of these blessings.

And so it is lastly, that we are justified “by faith.” Unless we believe in CHRIST, and in the method of salvation which He has provided, we shall not come and be justified by Him. It may be that men do not wish to be justified. They may think there is no need for it : they do not believe the doctrine of original sin ; they do not believe in the necessity of grace. These are Pelagians under another name. Or perhaps they do not believe in Sacra-

ments: they wish to justify themselves by something they can feel or do themselves—if not by the works of the moral law, yet by some other works which they think they can do. Such are many modern sectarians who think lightly of Baptism for themselves or for their little ones: and such would be many more if they acted consistently on their own principles; for what is the use of Baptism, if it does not justify? But if this is the appointed way of salvation; if by being thus justified “we have peace with God, through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, by Whom we have access by faith to that grace wherein we stand and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God,” then we see how immeasurably superior this great Sacrament is to that which was its type under the Law, and to which the Incarnate SAVIOUR in His own Person submitted. That communicated no new power; whereas when we are circumcised “with the circumcision made without hands,” we are “justified freely; we be made sons of God by adoption; we be made like the image of His only-begotten SON JESUS CHRIST; so we are enabled to walk religiously in good works, and finally by God’s mercy, as the result of this Justification, we shall attain to everlasting felicity.”¹

S. GEORGE THE MARTYR AND GEORGE THE ARIAN.

Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. Second Series.
Vol. VII. Part I.

It is one of those singular phenomena which are familiar to all readers of history, that the successful refutation of an error, as of a false statement, by no means sets the question at rest for the future. The error, apparently scotched and killed in one generation, starts up into new life in another; it finds friends, supporters, champions: the former answers are forgotten; the old refutations are among the dusty volumes of a past age, and lie in obscure corners of the library; when suddenly the old controversy is opened again, to be again closed; and then, after a lapse of years, again reopened, and reproduced as a novelty. Such has been, and such ever will be, the case with theological questions, and not a few historical ones too: the latter more especially when connected with the former.

It is only requisite for the error to have been asserted by some eminent writer, and it is certain periodically to reappear. Some reader, ignorant that the question has been fully discussed and investigated, gets hold of the false statement, and, delighted with the discovery, brings it out as something new. Other writers,

¹ Article xvii.

equally ignorant of the true facts, repeat the statement, and hundreds believe it. The history of S. George the Martyr is a case in point. Calvin was the first to declare his conviction that S. George was a myth, a mere creation of some one's imagination. He was followed by Dr. Reynolds and others, who were too glad to say something against what they called Romish saints; and Calvin's word is trusted in to this day by many who are quite ignorant that he was fully answered by the learned Peter Heylin.¹ Again, the historian Gibbon² flippantly identified him with the infamous George of Cappadocia, the Arian Bishop of Alexandria, and this notion is by no means uncommon even in our own time. We are ashamed to say that in that generally correct and excellent work, "Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology," the writer seems to have followed Gibbon's wilful error. We say wilful advisedly, for Gibbon had Heylin's work before him, without being at the trouble to look into the matter. The like complaint may be made against the new "Dictionnaire de Biographie Générale," (Paris, 1857); and Mr. Porter, so lately as 1855, has perpetuated the like error. In his work on Damascus he says, "that S. George was murdered at Alexandria;" and, again, "George the Saint, Bishop of Alexandria, was killed by the mob, during a revolt caused by his persecution of the heathen, in A.D. 361." (Vol. ii. p. 64, n. 8.) Here surely then is sufficient reason for our coming forward to correct an historical error, and to vindicate our Patron Saint. Mr. Hogg has done good service to the truth in the short paper he has published in the "Transactions of the Royal Society." It would indeed be a disgrace to our kingdom, and above all to our Queen and the noble Order of the Garter, if it were believed that our Patron Saint was either a non-entity or a heretic.

In this paper the writer has brought together a collection of ancient notices of S. George, in all of which he is spoken of both as a real person and as a Catholic saint. The first is the Chronicon Paschale, where we read:—

"266th Olympiad. *Consuls*, Carinus for the second time, and Numerianus. In the year 255 of the Ascension of our LORD into Heaven, a persecution of the Christians took place, and many suffered martyrdom; among whom also the *holy George* was *martyred*."

"We find from the 'Fasti Consulares' of Almeloveen, that in A.D. 284, or P.N.C. 284, Imp. M. Aurelius Carinus II. and M. Aurelius Numerianus were Consuls before 'Kal. Maii.'"

"The 266th Olympiad corresponds with A.D. 285; so, to 255 years after CHRIST's ascension, must be added the thirty-four years of

¹ "The Historie of that most famous Saint and Souldier of CHRIST JESUS, S. George of Cappadocia; asserted from the Fictions of the Middle Ages of the Church, and opposition of the present." By Peter Heylyn. 2nd Edition. 1633.

² Gibbon, Hist. ch. xxiii.

His age, which would make the A.D. = 289. But it is evident that the author of this Chronicon follows those chronologists who place the birth of CHRIST four years *earlier*. Consequently the A.D. would be 285."—Pp. 108, 109.

Procopius is the first historian who mentions S. George in express terms. He calls him "George the Martyr." Next we hear S. Adamnan, at the close of the seventh century, who writes on the authority of a pilgrim, Bishop Arculf:—"In Diospoli (Lydda, seu Lod) civitate, cujusdam Martyris Georgii in quadam domo statua marmorea," &c. Ven. Bede, in his "Ephemeris," gives April 23rd as S. George's day, together with two Gallic saints, Fortunatus and Achilleus:—

"Nona docet Fortunatumque et Achillea junctos,
Hac etiam invicto mundum qui sanguine temnis
Infinita refert Georgi Sancte trophæa."

9th Kal. Maii answers to April 23rd.

From these extracts it is quite evident that S. George was honoured as a Catholic saint and martyr long before the time of the Crusades, and was known as such not only in the Oriental Church, but in the British and Saxon.

We shall now give a few notices to prove that S. George was held in great estimation in early times by the Oriental Church, by having churches dedicated to his name. The anonymous author of the "Constantinopolitan Antiquities," writes that in a place called Hierieium, in Constantinople, Constantine the Great built a church; which church, Corinus tells us, was dedicated to S. George. This church must have been built within fifty years of S. George's martyrdom.

At Shaka, the ancient Saccæa, in Palestine there exist the ruins of a church with a Greek inscription—copied by Burckhardt—of which Mr. Hogg gives the following translation: "A church of the holy victorious martyr George, and of the holy (men) with him was built from the foundations with the offerings of Bishop Tiberinus. But the care of George and Sergius [erected] the sanctuary, and the addition of the temple in the year 263, great" This date, Mr. Hogg says, agrees with A.D. 367. This date, however, is not that of the founding of the Church, but of the *sanctuary* (*ισαριον*), and the *addition* (*προσθηκη*) erected by George and Sergius; the original building must have been much older.

"But in the year 1858, I was fortunately enabled, by a careful examination of the Greek inscription, (No. 40, Trans. Royal Soc. Lit. Vol. VI. p. 305,) which Mr. Cyril Graham had, in the previous summer, copied from a very ancient church—originally a heathen temple—at Ezra, in Syria, to determine most satisfactorily that *Saint* George

had *died before* the year A.D. 346, in which he is expressly called a 'Holy *Martyr*.' Also it is clear that this date occurred during the lifetime of the *other* George—the Alexandrian *bishop*—who survived for fifteen years longer, viz. to A.D. 362, and who then, having expiated his vices and base conduct by assassination, could *not*, under any consideration, be esteemed a *Martyr*."—P. 132.

These two churches are then standing proofs of the two facts, 1st, that the true S. George is a Catholic saint and martyr; and 2ndly, that he is wholly distinct from George the Arian bishop of Alexandria. We shall now give a history of these two personages.

From an examination and comparison of the best sources of information, Mr. Hogg gathers the following account. S. George was born at Lydda, in Syria; his parents were in good circumstances, and Christians; in which faith he was brought up; when young he was taken to Cappadocia; we next find him serving as a soldier in the army of the Emperor Diocletian at Nicomedia, then the metropolis of the eastern division of the empire. It was here that the famous edict was issued, which ordered that persecution of the Christians, commonly called the ninth: it was in this that S. George suffered. We have no cotemporary account of his martyrdom, unless one in Eusebius relates it; Eusebius gives no name, but, as Heylin observes, the legal maxim holds good, "*ubi constat de persona, nil refert de nomine*;" the probability is, that S. George is intended. The story is, that immediately on the edict being hung up to public view, a soldier of rank indignantly pulled it down and tore it in pieces: he was consequently the first who suffered under it. He is related to have borne his sufferings with the utmost calmness and patience. Later accounts have considerably embellished the simple narrative; his speech before the Emperor and Senate, and the particulars of his torments, adding that the day of his martyrdom was Good Friday, April 23rd. Metaphrastes relates that he was taken by Diocletian into the Temple of Apollo, who tried to induce him to sacrifice to the idol; S. George went up to the image, and making the sign of the cross, asked if he should offer sacrifice to it; this the demon in the image having declined, S. George commanded him to leave the image; and immediately the image fell to pieces. We give this story because there seems some probability that it may have been the origin of the legend of the slaying the dragon; this dragon being the devil. Another account says that he called the soul of the Empress Alexandra back from hell. We need not specify others.

After his martyrdom, the body of S. George was taken by his servant, and buried at his native place, Lydda, in Palestine,—a fact that has helped to confuse his history, for some knowing only that his name was someway connected with Lydda, have made it the scene of his death. Thus Friar Anselm writes: "In Berith

occidit draconem ; in Rama autem, quæ distat ab Hierusalem per viginti milliaria, fertur fuisse combustus." This latter point is closely connected with his becoming the Patron Saint of England, — a matter that we must next consider.

We have before noticed that pilgrims from the Holy Land brought back to England honourable mention of this saint ; so much so, that even before the first crusade we find churches were dedicated to his memory. Among the oldest are Thetford, and S. George's at Oxford, and probably, S. George's, Southwark. In Brinsop church, Herefordshire, there is a (Norman) tympanum, representing his slaying the dragon. No fewer than one hundred and sixty-two old parish churches are dedicated to his name alone, and four more have his name connected with other saints. We fear that those many "S. Georges" of the last century were rather in honour of the Hanoverian Guelph than of the holy martyr.

In the first crusade under Godfrey of Bouillon the following story is told of Robert the Monk, who wrote about 1120. The Crusaders having sat down to the siege of Antioch, were much distressed for want of food, both for themselves and their horses, besides suffering grievously from sickness. As a desperate resource, they determined on giving their enemies battle, on the event of which hung their whole fortune: "Our soldiers being wearied with the long continuance of the battle, and seeing that the number of the enemy decreased not, began to faint ; when suddenly an infinite number of heavenly soldiers, all in white, descended from the mountain, the standard-bearer of whom was S. George, with Mauritius and Demetrius, as leaders. Whom as soon as the Bishop of La Puy beheld, he called out with a loud voice, 'O soldiers ! see come to you the succours which God promised !'" With this help the enemy was routed and fled, and the camp with all its stores fell into the hands of the Christians. This battle is said to have been fought on S. Peter's Eve, 1098. A second apparition is related by Jacobus de Voragine, extracted from the Chroniclers of Antioch : "That as the Christian host was marching in Jerusalem, a beautiful youth appeared to a certain priest, telling him that he was S. George, one of CHRIST's captains, and directing him to take with them his relics, and that he himself would accompany them. After they had sat down before the city, and none durst attempt to scale the walls on account of the Saracens within, S. George, clad in white armour with a red cross, appeared, bidding them follow him, and promising them safety, and the possession of the city. Animated by this, they captured the city, and put the Saracens to the sword." A still better authenticated story of another apparition of the saint is told in Baronius' Annals, in 1190. During the Emperor Frederic's expedition into the east, when he was near Laodicea, "S. George,

as had happened before, was seen to march before the troops of Ludovic, of Helffertheim, giving aid to our army." This fact is attested by Ludovic himself before the Emperor and the whole army "*sub jurejurando et religione peregrinationis*." In the "*Gesta Francorum*," we read that S. George, again accompanied by S. Demetrius, engaged and routed the Turks for three days. Perhaps this refers to the first apparition we have mentioned.

It is very singular that the stories of S. George's appearing are confirmed by the Mohammedan nations, and even to this day acknowledged and believed. The following from Dr. Stanley's "*Sinai and Palestine*" is sufficient proof. Speaking of a Mussulman sepulchral chapel near Sarafend, the ancient Sarepta, dedicated to *El Khouder*, the writer says, "There is no tomb inside, only hangings before a recess. This variation from the actual type of the Mussulman sepulchres was, as we were told by the peasants on the spot, because *El Khouder* is not yet dead; he flies round and round the world; other chapels are built wherein he has appeared."¹

We shall not be surprised to see S. George very early invested with the honour of being the patron saint of soldiers, and of having military orders placed under his name. Baronius relates that S. George, together with SS. Sebastian and Mauritius, was invoked when conferring certain military rank and honours on any one. "*Romanam ipsam ecclesiam ad expugnandos fidei hostes hos precipue martyres invocare consuevisse, Mauritium, Sebastianum, et Georgium*." In the *Ordo Romanus*, the following prayer occurs on buckling on the shield:—"Domine Deus qui conteris bella, et adjuvor et protector es omnium in te sperantium, respice propitius invocationem nostram, et per merita Sanctorum tuorum Martyrum et Militum, Mauritii, Sebastiani, Georgii, præsta huic viro victoriam de hostibus, et salve eum tuo gratuito munere, Per," &c. In an old French ceremonial at the dubbing of a knight, the following account is given:—"Alors doit venir devant luy, et demander, Seigneur, au nom de Dieu et de Sanct George, donnez moy l'Ordre: et le dict chevalier, ou chef de guerre doit tirer l'espee nue vers le dict demandeur, et doit dire en frappant trois fois sur iceluy, Je te fais chevalier au nom de Dieu et de monseigneur Sanct George pour la foy et justice loyalment garder, et l'Eglise, femmes veufes, et orphelins defender." Thus, generally, he was looked upon as the patron of soldiers in different countries. Soon he was established as the particular protector of particular countries; Genoa and Burgundy placed themselves under his protection; and, lastly, England assumed both his name and his banner. Under that red cross banner her sons have fought and conquered in many a well contested field; seldom has that banner been borne down by opposing foes; and still seldomer has it been

¹ *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 274.

stained by cruelty and vengeance in the hour of victory. It is our boast that on that banner the sun never sets. We can only wish that those who boast of it, and live under it, would remember that to live under the cross implies Christian obligations as well as military. In both senses would we say to the Englishman, "*In hoc signo vinces*;" conquer with *the faith* as well as with the sword; carry the cross of CHRIST as well as the banner of S. George. Where one is planted, let the other also stand; but never forget that the red cross of England's banner symbolizes death for the sake of CHRIST, as well as death for your Queen and country.¹

Before that S. George was made the Patron Saint of England, and before there was any Order of the Garter, Frederic Duke of Austria instituted in 1245 a Military Order of the Hundred Knights, to guard the frontiers of his country from the Turks. Another Frederic, Emperor of Germany, instituted another Order in 1448, of *S. Georges Schilts*. In 1381, at Genoa, there was formed a regiment of native Italians—before the republic generally used mercenary troops—called S. George's Regiment,—a band that played a conspicuous part in many battles of those interminable Italian wars. All these, however, were only transitory, and have been completely eclipsed by the great English Order of S. George, now commonly called the "Garter;" about which we must say a few words, for it is closely connected with S. George's becoming the Patron Saint of England.

The Order of S. George was instituted by Edward III. at Windsor, in the year 1350, in the twenty-third year of his reign. The number of the knights was limited to twenty-six. By the constitutions of Archbishop Chicheley, A.D. 1415, S. George was solemnly installed as the Patron Saint of England:—

"The faithful people of England, though bound duly to praise God in all His saints, yet [ought] especially to extol and sound forth praises, and venerate Him with peculiar powers in His most glorious Martyr, the blessed George, the special patron and protector of this nation, as the speech of the world and the experience of grace from above (the best interpreter of all things,) do attest. For by his intervention not only the English army is protected against the assaults of enemies in time of war, but the host of clergy is corroborated in their peaceable fight under the suffrage of so great a patron, as we undoubtedly believe. We, therefore, desiring that the praises of God in His saints may be amplified, excited by the admonition of the king and the people of the kingdom, and by the advice of our brethren, and of the clergy of our province, and supported by the decree of our provincial council, imitating the devotion of the holy Fathers towards God's saints, do will, ordain, and charge, with the express consent of

¹ Our readers hardly need reminding that the "Union Flag" of Great Britain is the union of the two flags of England and Scotland, each bearing the crosses of S. George and S. Andrew respectively. Thus Englishmen fight under the *double cross* of SS. Andrew and George.

our brethren and clergy, that the feast of blessed George the Martyr be celebrated solemnly every year for the time to come for ever, in the manner and with the office of a double feast, both by the clergy and people of our province of Canterbury, in all churches of the same; and we charge that there be a cessation from all servile work on the said feast, in all the cities and places in our province, as on the feast of the Nativity of our LORD; that the faithful people may assemble in greater numbers, praise GOD, and more devoutly implore the patronage of this saint, and of all the blessed, and more fervently pray for the safety of the king and kingdom."

Thus S. George was solemnly appointed Patron Saint of England in the room of S. Edward, who was formerly considered such; we say solemnly appointed by this council, for for many years before he had been popularly esteemed such, and had, in fact, superseded S. Edward; his festival became *majus duplex*, equal to Christmas Day; directions were given to anticipate it or postpone it, if it fell during the solemnization of Easter. It continued to be so observed until the fifth or sixth of Edward VI., having its proper Epistle and Gospel, viz.; S. James i. 2, and S. John xvi. 1. The collect in the Sarum Missal—"Offerimus tibi Domine solenne sacrificium pro veneranda S. Georgii Martyris tui passione, deprecantes clementiam tuam, ut per hæc SS. Mysteria antiqui hostis tentamenta te triumphante vincamus, et æternæ remunerationis præmium te largiente sequamur. Per." In Edward's reign both day and office were abolished; but these acts being expunged in Mary's reign, the old order of things revived; in Elizabeth's, the day was retained, but unfortunately not the office. Would it not be possible, in these days of revival, to reinstate our national saint into something like his ancient position, at least in those churches dedicated to his memory? Surely, when the Queen, the Bishop of Winchester as Prelate of the Order, the Bishop of Oxford as Chancellor, keep S. George's day in S. George's chapel, at Windsor, lesser churches, also dedicated to our national saint, might follow so great an example, and commence, at least, a movement so truly national.

We must now turn our attention to the history of the other George, the Arian Bishop of Alexandria, with whom our S. George has been so often confounded.

This George, according to a cotemporary authority (Ammianus Marcellinus), was born in a fuller's mill at Epiphania, in Cilicia; his first occupation was that of purveyor to the army, at Constantinople, where, according to the testimony of S. Athanasius, he was making great profits, not in the most honest way; being found out, he fled to Cappadocia; here he commenced his intrigues. He adopted the profession of Arianism, the better to ingratiate himself with the party then in power at Court; being found a useful, and at the same time an unscrupulous man, he gained friends, who got

his former malpractices overlooked and pardoned. On the death of Gregory, the former Arian Bishop of Alexandria—with whom George is sometimes confounded—and on the banishment of S. Athanasius, he was considered a suitable instrument for forwarding the interests of the faction at that place, and so was appointed to succeed Gregory as (Arian) Bishop of Alexandria. Supported by the Government, especially by his two friends, the Count Diodorus, and Dracontius, master of the mint, he took to his old ways, and commenced a system of oppression and extortion, which brought on him the hatred of the whole city, both Christian and heathen. S. Athanasius draws a sad picture of his treatment of the former, compelling some to communicate with the Arian priests, and cruelly abusing those who refused to do so; even the consecrated virgins were stripped and scourged by his orders. The Catholics bore this with much patience, and, apparently, without resistance; not so the heathen; these latter had long been goaded to frenzy by his extortions of money, and only wanted opportunity to gratify their revenge. The opportunity came; passing by a fair heathen temple, (*speciosum Genii templum*), he stopped and exclaimed, “*Quamdiu sepulchrum hoc stabit?*” the people, supposing that he intended to destroy it, suddenly fell upon him, and with every mark of indignity tore him in pieces. With him fell Dracontius and Diodorus, their bodies being paraded through the city on the back of a camel, taken to the seashore, and burnt, and the ashes thrown into the sea. The *Chronicon Paschale*, while recording the exact time that this outrage took place, lets us know that it was the accession of Julian the Apostate, and the sending of his edict to Alexandria that emboldened the heathen there. In Mr. Hogg’s translation it runs thus:—

“285th Olympiad. *Consuls*, Mamertinus and Neveta. Julian, learning the death of the Emperor Constantius, making manifest his own apostasy and impiety; and despatching an edict against Christianity throughout the whole world, ordered all idols to be restored. Whereupon the Gentile Greeks in the east, being excited, immediately in Alexandria, which is in Egypt, having seized *George*, the Bishop of that city, murdered him, and profanely insulted his corpse. For, placing it upon a camel, they carried it round about the whole city. And afterwards, gathering together the dead carcasses of different brutes with their bones, and mingling them with his corpse, they burnt them, and scattered them abroad.”—P. 124.

On this Mr. Hogg remarks that, according to *Almeloveen*, Fl. Mamertinus et Fl. Nevitta were consuls in 362, while the 285th Olympiad is 361. But if the murder took place about Christmas Day, i.e., on the last day of 361, the difference of date is easily accounted for.

These dates are very important, for we find from the same

Chronicon Paschale—which we quoted above—that the true S. George was martyred in the year 285, being seventy-seven years before the death of George the Arian; we have mentioned above that two churches, one at Shaka and the other at Ezra, were dedicated to S. George *before* the death of his Arian namesake.

We trust we have made plain in the above article the following points:—1st. That S. George the Martyr and George the Arian are two different and distinct persons. 2nd. That the first is a real character and a true martyr.

It is not difficult to see how the confusion between these two arose; both are called “George of Cappadocia,” though, singularly enough, neither was born there, but both passed their youth in that country; both died by the hand of the heathen; both were reputed martyrs by the respective communities to which each belonged, and, no doubt, the Arians helped to confuse the identity in order to gain credit for their partizan.

We had intended to take our readers into the legendary history of our S. George, and to show how he became connected with the now universal adjunct to his name—the Dragon; we find, however, that our space will not allow this, without curtailing what is of far more importance—real history; we shall only say, that the addition of the Dragon is purely of western invention, the east knows nothing of it; with the latter, he is a soldier saint of great repute, and is the patron of soldiers.

DR. STANLEY ON THE BIBLE.

The Bible: its Form and Substance. Three Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford and London: J. H. and James Parker. 1862.

Those who are very susceptible to the influence of rhetoric, and not over strong in the logical faculty, are no doubt much taken with Professor Stanley's preaching. It is impossible for any one wholly to resist the charm of well chosen and beautiful language; and with the majority of those who are influenced by the sermons they hear, the language probably produces more effect than the argument. Examples are constantly shown of the way in which fallacies are received as truths at the mouth of some good speaker, until some other good speaker gets up to strip them of their finery, and show their naked ugliness; and examples are also frequent enough

of cases in which the eloquent propounder of fallacies carries everything his own way, by having the last word, or by remaining altogether unanswered; or takes a great many with him because his fallacies, though not more eloquently delivered, perhaps, than his antagonist's truths, were yet much easier and more comfortable to receive. If Arius had been gifted with the eloquence of Chrysostom, the number of the orthodox in the fourth century would probably have been very much smaller than it was; and if Dr. Colenso were Dr. Stanley, his arguments would, no doubt, have been received far more widely, and with much less contempt than they have been. In fact, sermons like those which Dr. Stanley preaches are so well suited to the taste of the day, and partake so much of the easy-going, well-chosen English which in *Times'* leaders and Palmerston speeches proves itself influential quite irrespectively of its veracity or its logic, that it must be considered a great blessing to the Church of England still to number him among those who, with their sympathies towards her much weakened in some points, are yet in many particulars supporters of her external position and her doctrine.

But, in proportion as we are thankful for this fact, we are apprehensive of the mischief which is likely to be done to the rising generation, if the advancing influence of a man like Dr. Stanley should be systematically used to help those who are endeavouring to undermine the old foundations of popular religion, and to enforce, in a charming and seducing disguise, the crotchets of the sceptical party. The indecent and savage attack lately made upon the Pentateuch has failed to exercise much influence, chiefly through the hasty fierceness with which the blows have been struck, and the want of skill with which Dr. Colenso's really feeble batteries have been unmasked. Far more dangerous will any attack upon the Bible be which shall come before the world clothed in the cautious, suggestive, plausible, popular, and pleasant style of "the Oxford Liberal of twenty years' standing," the official Professor, and the experienced Court Chaplain.

Such an attack has not yet been made; but some of Dr. Stanley's labours have a very dangerous leaning in that direction. A sermon quite recently published, and preached so lately as on Sexagesima Sunday of the present year, opens with the following passage on the text, "The serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field," &c., to the end of the fifteenth verse of the chapter:—

"How many thoughts are suggested by this primeval chapter of the Sacred History! We might analyse it critically, and dig out of its venerable language and structure the original meaning of each word and each part of the narrative, in our English version so often misread. We might endeavour to track its unknown authorship, as of the other portions of these early records, through the turns and changes which our modern division into chapters and our modern nomenclature have

so greatly obscured. We might compare its simple teaching with the elaborate epic of the 'Paradise Lost,' and show how many of our common notions on the Fall of Man we owe to Milton, how few to the Bible. We might go through the history of the interpretation of these chapters—showing how their true spiritual signification, as caught by the Fathers of the Eastern Church was gradually lost in the ruder theology of the West, and has only of recent years again been restored to Christendom."¹

This is very cautious language as to what it actually states respecting the portion of Holy Scripture referred to; but its insinuations, it will be observed, are important. The several hypotheses of the possible courses that the preacher might have taken remind one of the way in which counsel sometimes make attacks on opposing witnesses: "I might have said this man was a liar, I might have declared him an impostor, I might have told you that he is passing under a false name; but no, that is not the course which I propose to take: far be it from me to deal with anything but his evidence." But what the jury will believe the barrister well knows; and it is what he means them to believe, though he happens to have no evidence to prove his various hypotheses. It comes really very much to the same thing when Dr. Stanley insinuates, as he does in the passage we have quoted, (1) that the English version does not represent the true meaning of the narrative of the Fall; (2) that the authorship of the "early records" contained in the Bible is unknown; (3) that an important obscurity has arisen from the subdivision of the Bible into chapters; (4) that "recent years," (i.e., the years which have been enlightened by the sceptical school of copyists from Germany, who look to Professor Jowett as a leader,) have restored to us a true meaning of this narrative which had been lost to Western Christendom for ages. Dr. Stanley very much magnifies the importance of the critical school to which he belongs when he speaks of these things as if they were proved. No doubt his friends, and perhaps he himself with them, do not believe that Moses was the author of the Book of Genesis, and that there is any real as well as "spiritual" meaning in the account of the Fall; but then, this school is very credulous in its unbelief, and it is too much to take things for granted in this manner because a few writers, superstitiously self-reliant, choose, in the face of all ancient and most of modern Christendom, loudly to say that they are so. Theologians will not be entrapped by the brilliancy of Dr. Stanley's rhetoric, as he perfectly well knows; but it is very likely that untheological persons who are so entrapped will take his hypotheses for positive statements, which we do not believe the writer would venture to make, and which we are quite sure he could not support in fair argument against learned opponents if he did make them.

¹ A Sermon on Human Corruption, p. 5.

The Sermons on the Bible which we have named at the head of this article, not only give accidental illustrations of the same disposition to depreciate the authority of the Holy Scriptures as they have come down to us, but make a direct attempt to prove that the world will come to a higher appreciation of their value when they have arrived at a lower appreciation of their truth. The object is stated in the second paragraph :—

“If in this short statement I can allay any needless alarm, or satisfy any innocent doubt, or induce any one student to value his Bible more truly, or persuade any two opponents to find a common standing ground beyond what they thought for, my purpose will be answered.”—P. 26.

The principle is, in some mysterious manner which we do not comprehend, based on the *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* of Hebrews i. 1, and is enunciated in the words “out of what seems at first sight the weakness of Scripture, comes its most enduring strength; when it is most weak, then it is indeed most strong.” No doubt the Apostle was strongest when he was strong in God’s grace and weak in self-reliance; but how Holy Scripture can gain strength through proof that it is less the Word of God than we thought it was, is a parable that lies beyond our understanding. We might as well try to understand Mr. Maurice,—a piece of presumption we have not yet attempted.

We can, understand, however, how Dr. Stanley, or any one else who has such views of Holy Scripture, can begin their strengthening process by an unworthy comparison between the Word of God and the Koran, the substance of which may be expressed in the few words, “Take the Koran at its best, the Bible is really the better book of the two.”

“In order to bring out fully and distinctly this characteristic of our sacred Book, it will be useful to contrast it throughout with what others esteem their sacred book. For this purpose it will be useful to take that which is next in dignity and importance, the Koran of Mahometanism, and to ask wherein the Bible differs from it—(not, I repeat, in authority or doctrine—this would be superfluous,) but in the outward appearance and structure by which our attention is challenged to it, even before we open it. Grant the excellence of the Koran to the very utmost,—concede to it all that has ever been claimed for it,—still the differences which I am about to mention serve to bring out the contrast between what the Bible would be if narrowed down to our puny measurements, and what, in its own divine and universal excellence, it actually is.”—P. 27.

* * * * *

“The Koran represents, not merely one single person, but one single scene and phase of society. It is, with a very few exceptions, purely Arabian. It is what the Bible would be if all external influences were obliterated, and it presented one single exclusive phase of Jewish life.

But *our* sacred Book, however Jewish and Oriental in its origin, is a stream formed of the confluence of many tributaries. Even the scenery and the life of Palestine were far more diversified than those of Arabia, so that whilst the Koran contains hardly any allusions except to the phenomena of the desert, the Bible includes topics which come home to almost every condition and position of life. The sea, the mountain, the town; the pastoral, the civilized, the republican, the royal state, can all find expression in its words. And not only so, but Egypt, Chaldæa, Persia, Greece, Rome, all came into contact with its gradual formation; so that alone of all sacred books it avowedly includes the words, and thoughts, and forms of other religions than its own—alone of all Oriental books, it has an actual affinity of aspect and form with the Northern and the Western world—alone almost of religious books, its story is constantly traversing the haunts of the world at large. The Koran, the Vedas, even Thomas à Kempis and S. Augustine, '*stay at home.*' But the Bible is a book that travels far and wide."—P. 30.

Are we not right in saying that such a comparison is unworthy, and that it tends to depreciate the estimation in which the Holy Bible is held? Who that knows the Koran, does not know that it is an anti-Christian book, full of anti-Christian teaching, and containing very decided blasphemy? The book is not known to those whom Dr. Stanley cares to have for an audience, and of course they are ready to receive the impression which the preacher seems desirous of giving them,—that the question between the Koran and the Bible is one of style, nationality, the influence of scenery, and so forth. He even puts a personal pronoun into italics, for the sake of insinuating that the Koran is really a sacred book, in the sense that "*our* Sacred Book" is so; as if there was any ground whatever for putting side by side as in the least similar in their weight, the claims which our Book has to be called sacred, and those possessed by one so full of manifest lying and sensuality as the Koran!

This kind of language towards the Holy Bible is but a reproduction of the tone which was assumed towards Christianity itself by the "moral" freethinkers of the last century. Gibbon's conceit could elevate himself above all Churches, sects, and non-Christian religions, and take a lofty survey of the whole as they lay, in the plain of his imagination, on an equal level. His own self-consciousness was so extravagant, that any "view" which he took up would be taken from its towering height. It never occurred to him that the elevation to which that self-consciousness removed him, was such as to give him false impressions in respect to the relative importance, proportions, and solidity of the religions he was comparing. Accordingly the whole scene, as he works it into his picture, is distorted; the virtues of heathens and heretics are exaggerated, and the record of their vices suppressed; every failing of orthodox Christians is magnified, and their holiness

reluctantly admitted, as if the writer's regard for truth was so great, that he wished to guard himself against saying too much about it, for fear he should pervert the truth by making orthodox Christians more estimable than heretics or heathens.

It is certainly not too strong a censure to pass upon Dr. Stanley's comparison between the Koran and the Bible, that it partakes of this character;¹ that it raises the former to a level, which is unjust to the Bible, when it brings the two into comparison merely by means of their superficial characteristics as literary compositions; that in suppressing all mention of those far more important characteristics which show the worthlessness of the Koran as a "sacred book," when set beside the Bible, he is guilty of depreciating the latter by making it appear to be only *primus inter pares*, instead of the sole written Word of God. Such a conclusion as that expressed in the last two lines is really the legitimate conclusion forced upon the reader by the fair perusal of Dr. Stanley's first Sermon on the "Form and Substance of the Bible," and by his interpretation of the words, "God spake at sundry times and in divers manners."

The Second Sermon is on the words, "God spake by the Prophets;" and the Third (which has too little in it, beside "word-painting," to need any particular notice,) occupies about a sixth of the space occupied by the whole three, with showing that "God hath spoken by His SON." From the former we shall proceed to make a few extracts, on which we have some words of comment to offer with reference to the general question indicated by the title at the head of this page.

It appears to the learned Professor that "the very name of 'Prophet' is expressive of its great design," and thus he supports his opinion:—

"If the derivation of the word, as commonly given, be correct—the 'boiling or bubbling over' of the Divine Fountain of Inspiration within the soul—it is impossible to imagine a phrase more expressive of the truth which it conveys. It is one of those words which conveys a host of imagery and doctrine in itself. In the most signal instances of the sites chosen for the Grecian oracles, we find that they were marked by the rushing forth of a living spring from the recesses of the native rocks of Greece, the Castalian spring at Delphi, the rushing stream of the Hercyna at Lebadea. It was felt that nothing could so well express the Divine voice speaking from the mysterious abysses of the unseen world, as those inarticulate but lively ebullitions of the life-giving element from its unknown mysterious sources. Such a figure was even more significant in the remoter East. The prophetic utterances were indeed the bubbling, teeming springs of life in those hard, primitive rocks, in those dry, parched levels. 'My heart,' to use the phrase of

¹ We may refer also to his Lecture on Mahometanism in the "History of the Eastern Church," as exhibiting the same defect.

the Psalmist in the original language, 'is bursting, bubbling over with a good matter.' That is the very image which would be drawn from the abundant crystal fountains which all along the valley of the Jordan pour forth their full-grown streams, scattering fertility and verdure as they flow, over the rough ground. And this is the exact likeness of the springs of prophetic wisdom and foresight, containing in themselves and their accomplishment the fulness of the stream which was to roll on and fertilise the ages."—P. 51.

Let the reader calmly look through this quotation again, and ask himself whether we are really to accept the writer of it as a leading interpreter of Holy Scripture in the nineteenth century? Is it less than absolute profanity thus to insinuate a comparison between the impostures and the diabolical influences which constituted the Grecian oracles, and the institution in which "God spake by the Prophets?" And is it less than absolute absurdity to represent David, full of the object of his worship, as influenced in the choice of his subordinate phrases by the special character of the brooks which flow through the valley of the Jordan? The suggestion is made utterly worthless by the pretty well established fact that impressions derived from natural scenery were unknown to the ancients. But apart from this, the whole paragraph is as good, or as bad, an illustration of picturesque preaching run mad as can be expected to issue from the pen of Dr. Stanley, and we embalm it in our pages accordingly.

The delightful proof that prophets were called so because of the streams which "bubbled up" in the localities where they prophesied, is followed by a statement that the foundation of prophetic teaching was a protest against the separation of morality from religion; and this statement is ultimately urged upon the reader to the depreciation of sacrificial and ceremonial religion, as the statements of the first Sermon are to the depreciation of the Word of God.

"The one great corruption to which all Religion is exposed, is its separation from morality. The very strength of the religious motive has a tendency to exclude, or disparage, all other tendencies of the human mind, even the noblest and best. It is against this corruption that the Prophetic Order from first to last constantly protested. Even the mere outward appearance and organization of the order bore witness to the greatness of the opposite truth of the inseparable union of morality and religion. Alone of all the high offices of the Jewish Church, they were called by no outward form¹ of consecration, and were selected from no special tribe or family. But the most effective witness to this great doctrine was borne by their actual teaching.

"Amidst all their varieties, there is hardly a Prophet, from Samuel downwards, whose life or writings do not contain an assertion of this

¹ This is of course quite untrue, the prophets being anointed just as much as the priests.

truth. It is to them as constant a topic, as the most peculiar and favourite doctrine of any sect or party is in the mouths of the preachers of such a sect or party at the present day, and it is rendered more forcible by the form which it takes of a constant protest against the sacrificial system of the Levitical ritual, which they either, in comparison with the Moral Law, disparage altogether, or else fix their hearers' attention to the moral and spiritual truth which lay behind it."—P. 59.

These assertions are illustrated by nearly two pages of texts, taken from the Prophets and the Psalms, such as, "To obey is better than sacrifice;" "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt-offering;" "I desired mercy and not sacrifice;" "I hate, I despise your feast-days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies;" with many more to the like purpose. We should have been glad if we could have spared room to reprint this string of texts, but their character is indicated by the two or three quoted; and the value of Dr. Stanley, as an interpreter of Holy Scripture, may be seen from his conclusion that "mercy and justice, judgment and truth, repentance and goodness—not sacrifice, not fasting, not ablutions, not local or hereditary sanctity—is the burden of the whole Prophetic teaching of the old Testament."

If this was really the case, in what manner are we to account for the strange fact of one divinely commissioned order of men, the Prophets, opposing themselves by virtue of their commission to another divinely commissioned order of men, the Priests, of whose commission sacrifice was the principal characteristic? Is it reverent to think that God would send two institutions into the world, prophecy and sacrifice, and bid them "protest" against each other? Of course, the notion is absurd, and founded on a mistake into which nothing but the determination to write down sacerdotal theories could have led Dr. Stanley. The true relation of such sayings of the Prophets to the institutions of the Jewish Law may be seen from the Psalm out of which he quotes his second text, and from the context of others of the passages he has cited. It is when the Moral Law has been outraged that the Ceremonial becomes unacceptable at the hands of those who offer it. Repentance paves the way for its being acceptable again as it was before. While the service offered is hollow-hearted it becomes a mockery as respects him who offers it; but when God has created in such an one a clean heart, and renewed a right spirit within him, he can look forward to a return of God's Presence; "Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering, and whole burnt-offering; then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine altar." Is there one word in the Old Testament or the New to show that when sin had so polluted the worship of the Jews as to make God say by His Prophet, "I hate, I despise your feast-days,

... though ye offer Me burnt-offerings, and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them," God was "making a protest against the sacrificial system of the Levitical ritual," which He Himself had ordained? Are not these words as the cords of the scourge with which our Lord drove the sellers of sacrifices out of the Temple for the very purpose of purifying it? And what a perversion is it of the plain teaching of the Bible to turn these prophetic denunciations of whitened sepulchres against the Temple of God itself; and make it appear that the institution of Prophecy was principally characterised by a protest against the system and observances of the only religion which God had then revealed to the Jews, and the Ceremonial Law of it by which He Himself had strictly bound them! Yet so far does Professor Stanley carry this perverse reading of the Bible, that he actually drags in S. John the Evangelist as carrying on the line of such protest into the Christian Dispensation. "With these accents on his lips the Last of the Prophets expired." Let it be added that the "Last of the Prophets" was also the First of Christian Ritualists and Dogmatists; the Book of Revelation and the Gospel of S. John being a standing answer to these anti-ritual and anti-theological rhapsodies of the modern preacher.

The Sermon before us teems with such a treatment of Holy Scripture. What is to be found there the preacher minimizes to the lowest degree of authority; what is not to be found anywhere but in the preacher's own imagination and self-consciousness he elevates to the highest. That Prophets should be brought into such close relation with the Divine Mind as to be the mouthpiece of it to men is a wonderful fact not even mentioned among the illustrations of the truth that "God spake by the Prophets;" that they knew the human heart so well as exactly to time their warnings to circumstances, as Elijah did when he appeared before Ahab "like the ghost of the murdered Naboth"—of which expression we may remark in passing that Elijah appeared so like himself, and not Naboth or his ghost, that Ahab knew him directly—this is made much of, as "the most precious, the most supernatural, of all the Prophetic gifts." If it were our purpose to enter into such details we could show that as the Bible itself becomes little more than a very superior human composition in the light of Dr. Stanley's dogmatic teaching, so Prophecy dwindles down to a mere concrete of high mental qualities applied to the special purpose of warning men not to pay too much attention to religion as it is plainly set before them in God's revelations, but to build up a "moral" theory of their own which shall stand superior to it.

But with a little further illustration of the fanciful manner in which Professor Stanley deals with the Bible we shall conclude. In the Sermon on Human Corruption, preached on Sexagesima Sunday, is this passage: "Do not halt in your pursuit of know-

ledge, in your ardour for truth ; ' be wise,' (I quote our LORD's own fearless words) ' be wise as the' old 'serpent' himself, more subtle than any beast of the field, than any child of man."¹

This injunction is quoted as "our LORD's own fearless words," when it is perfectly well known that our LORD said nothing of the kind. Our LORD's words ("fearless" is an almost insulting epithet to add to Divine words) are "be ye therefore wise as *serpents*," and by no means giving us any reason to interpret the plural noun of "the old serpent,"—ὁ ὄφας of the Apocalypse,—but rather the contrary, by its apposition with the other member of the injunction, "harmless as doves." This seems so plain that one wonders how any preacher could let his fancy run riot into an interpretation of the words of our LORD so verging on blasphemy, as the recommendation of a wisdom which S. James calls "devilish." "The devil again," says S. Augustine, "is a serpent, *that old serpent*; are we commanded then to imitate the devil, when our Shepherd told us, Be ye wise as serpents, and simple as doves?" Far more likely is it that in our limited knowledge of the habits of serpents, we are unaware of some important ones which were perfectly well known to our LORD and the Apostles, and that these habits are evidence of the serpent being still "more subtil than any beast of the field?"² Surely it would be more honest as well as more reverent to give such an interpretation. "The spirit of the Prophets asks, *first*, Is it true?" says Dr. Stanley. It was not in such a spirit the same Dr. Stanley said he was "quoting our LORD's own fearless words" when he wrote "be wise as the old serpent himself."

There seems to be, in fact, a strange incapacity for interpreting Holy Scripture, for taking a really comprehensive view of "the Bible: its form and its substance," in Professor Stanley and those who go with him in his halting belief of its real inspiration. They tell us over and over again that Truth is everything; they bid us cast Patristic and Ecclesiastical interpretations to the winds if they do not agree with the Truth; and then they give us pretty clearly to understand that the Truth about Holy Scripture is only to be found in the pages of a Jowett, a Stanley, a Maurice, or, perhaps, a Colenso.³ And yet, as the illustration we have just given will show, this "Truth" that is offered us is really sometimes as like

¹ Sermon on Human Corruption, p. 23.

² Such subtil habits seem to be referred to in the mention by Jacob of "the adder that biteth the horse heels, so that his rider shall fall backward:" and in the Psalmist's reference to the same serpent's determined resistance by his voluntary deafness to the otherwise irresistible "voice of the charmer."

³ We must say that Bishop Colenso has been very badly treated by Dr. Stanley and his friends. The *Times* and all the small fry of Oxford-writ weekly papers are evidently minded to throw him overboard as "a tub to the whale" of public indignation. Surely the Bishop may say to every such writer, "at tu indignus qui faceres tamen."

the opposite sort of thing as can possibly be. We will give one further illustration of this, in which an important *inference* is drawn from the Bible, and then draw to an end our notice of these Sermons.

"We speak sometimes with disdain of moral essays, as dull, and dry, and lifeless. Dull, and dry, and lifeless they truly are, till the Prophetic spirit breathes into them. But let religious faith and love once find its chief, its proper vent in them, as it did of old in the Jewish Church—let a second Wesley arise who shall do what the Primate of his day wisely but vainly urged as his gravest counsel¹ on the first Wesley, that is, throw all the ardour of a Wesley into the great unmis-takeable doctrines and duties of life as they are laid down by the Prophets of old and by CHRIST in the Gospels,—let *these* be preached with the same fervour as that with which Andrew Melville enforced Presbyterianism, or Laud enforced Episcopacy, or Whitfield enforced Assurance, or Calvin Predestination,—then, perchance, we shall understand in some degree what was the propelling energy of the Prophetic order in the Church and Commonwealth in Israel."—P. 66.

Of course we do not deny that it was an error to cry down altogether the moral essays which had taken possession of our pulpits in the last century, (though we believe it to have been the theoretical teaching without the practical exhibition of morality which led to the distaste for ethical sermons;) and the substance of the paragraph quoted does not contain anything from which we dissent, so far as it contains anything at all, except in the last few words by which the reader is led to believe, as an undoubted fact, that the prophetic order exercised a vast "propelling energy"² in the Church and Commonwealth of Israel. Let any careful reader of Old Testament history consider for a short time what result the prophets were sent to effect, and how much of it they did effect, and he will certainly arrive at the same conclusion with ourselves that this is, whatever its object, a most audacious misrepresentation of fact as fact is stated in the Bible.

For this "propelling energy" must mean influence to propel "the Church and Commonwealth of Israel" in the direction in which the teachings and warnings of the prophets were intended to "propel" them. Yet what is more conspicuously evident from the history of Israel than that they were from first to last a most immovable and "stiff-necked" people, so that from Moses to S. Stephen it was always the complaint of the prophets, "Ye do always resist the HOLY GHOST, as your fathers did, so do ye." Take the more critical periods of Jewish history, and see how the prophets failed to "propel the Church and Commonwealth of

¹ See Wesley's Life, i. 222. [Which life? That of Coke and Moore, Whitehead, Southey, Watson, or Smith?]

² Elsewhere, adopting a modern slang-term, he calls the Prophets the friends of progress!

Israel," though they were such prophets as Moses, Samuel, Elijah, Jeremiah, or S. John the Baptist, and it will be found ever to be the same with them. Even under the stupendous "propelling energy" of Moses, there was a continual recoil in the most opposite direction, as in the case of the golden calf: and so short a time did the propulsion last that a few generations saw "every man doing that which was right in his own eyes" apparently both in "the Church and Commonwealth of Israel." In the days of Samuel, God's own words to the prophet are, "According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken Me, and served other gods; so do they also unto thee." Elijah, that prophet whose words seem to have had surpassing energy in them for any public purpose, yet complains at the end of his ministry, "I have been very jealous for the LORD GOD of hosts; because the children of Israel have forsaken Thy covenant, thrown down Thine altars, and slain Thy prophets with the sword: and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away." What a witness are the prophecies of Jeremiah, the warnings of Ezekiel, and his lifelong prophetic sufferings, against this theory of "propelling energy;" and how much more testimony of the same kind is to be drawn out of the minor prophets! How continually was God giving them warning of the fate that the disobedience and wickedness of the Jews was bringing on the "Church and Commonwealth of Israel," and how great was the barrenness of results in that ministration of ages which could not draw that Church and Commonwealth away from the destruction into which it was steadily propelled by those among whom it existed. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!"

It is in the face of such testimony, and much more of a similar nature, to the *non*-propelling energy of prophetic labours that Dr. Stanley speaks of the "propelling energy of the prophetic order," as "the most precious, the most supernatural, of all the prophetic gifts." There may possibly be some recondite paradox in the preacher's mind which might prove of value if it could be transferred to the hearer's mind: but as the passage stands, we confess it looks to us as like a perversion of Holy Scripture as possible: and whether it springs out of a desire to be novel,¹ an unbridled imagination, or a determination to support a crotchet at

¹ Not however that there is anything really original in these sermons. The idea of the prophetic is professedly borrowed from J. S. Mill, and garnished by Dr. Stanley with a few geographical illustrations of bubbling fountains, &c., *more suo*. The fact of the Bible not being the work of one author or age has been commented by a multitude of writers.

all hazards, the result seems to us to show that Dr. Stanley's dealings with "The Bible: its form, and its substance," are eminently untrustworthy. We will not yield to that talented writer, or to any of his school in our desire for the Truth above all things; and are quite ready to acknowledge with Archbishop Whateley, as quoted in these sermons, that "it makes all the difference in the world whether we put the duty of Truth in the first place, or in the second place." But we cannot accept for Truth such depreciation and misinterpretation of the Holy Bible as Dr. Stanley has here put into our hands; and we shall protest again and again against the obtrusive self-assertion by which writers of his school claim to be regarded as the most faithful exponents of the Bible known to our generation. Such they are very far indeed from being, at present.

THE HELIOTROPIUM OF DREXELIUS.

The Heliotropium, or Conformity of the Human will to the Divine. Expounded in Five Books by JEREMY DREXELIUS. Translated from the original Latin by the Rev. R. N. SHUTTE, with a Preface by the Bishop of Brechin. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co.

THE thoughtful treatise which comes before us under this quaint and somewhat unattractive title, was doubtless in the original purpose of the author simply the enunciation of truths which had shone into his mind from the illumination that follows true personal communion with "the Light of the world." He had no thought probably of opposing heresies, or counteracting erroneous opinions. Men who live in the ceaseless devotion and perfect self-abnegation to which this good father had vowed himself, retain very little consciousness of the cavilling voices, the contradiction of sinners which fret and rage in the world without. Living in constant recollection of the presence of God, they cannot understand how in the outer circles of infinite life which radiate from that one centre the knowledge of the Divine will becomes broken, and so garbled and mingled with falsehood, that the dross is often mistaken for the refined gold. Thus the correction of error does not appear to them as an urgent duty: only as the Divine wisdom brightening in their souls while they ascend step by step nearer to the light, the heavenly love which kindles simultaneously in their hearts, drives them to shed forth some rays of their growing treasure upon their poorer brethren. Thus it hap-

pens that unconsciously to themselves, the inherent power of the truth which they are allowed to transmit, combats the evil they know not.

So it comes to pass in the present instance that these deep meditations of a devout mind have formed themselves into a determined statement of specific doctrines, and a strong protest against positive heresies. The one great doctrine which the whole work promulgates is the co-existence of the freedom of the human will with the omnipotence of Divine grace.

We may see at a glance how many errors in the theory of justification by faith only, predestination, reprobation, and special election, such a work is calculated to meet; and being, as it is, the fruit of the author's personal growth in the spiritual life, it will be found at the same time of great practical benefit to those who are seeking to live near to God.

Drexelius' style is exceedingly quaint, and will sometimes jar on the taste of nineteenth century readers, especially in some of the numerous illustrations with which his text abounds. It would have helped the sale of the book, we imagine, if some of these drawn from fabulous histories in which the good Father appears to believe with much simplicity, had been omitted, chiefly because they are altogether out of date in this age, and unknown to the general reader. But we must remember that we have the highest authority, that of Scripture itself, for illustrating truth by fables even more impossible than any of those quoted by Drexelius; and further, in his times the heathen mythology was the fruitful source from which the most pious writers took their examples.

Our author is very successful in the hidden symbolical meaning which he discovers in some of the minor details of Scripture history, as in the following beautiful example.

"An Ardent Will. This consists not merely in willing or not willing that which God wills or wills not, but solely on account of His not willing or willing, to reject the former and to accept the latter with ardent desire, and to have no other reason for doing one thing, and leaving another undone, than the Divine goodpleasure. If one were to question a man possessed of such a will as to why he does not will one thing but does will another, he will reply that he has no other reason than that he finds that God does not will the one, and does will the other. 'I love,' says S. Bernard, 'because I love, and I love that I may love, for He Who is loved is Love.' S. Augustine counsels us that we ought to feel that as God has willed that all things should exist on account of Himself, so we also should will that neither we ourselves nor anything else should exist, except on account of God and His will.

"When the old law was still in force, God willed that every article dedicated to the altar and tabernacle should be wrapped in a blue covering, and that when so concealed it should be borne by Levites. The command runs thus:—'And they shall take all the instruments of

ministry, wherewith they minister in the sanctuary, and put them in a cloth of blue, and cover them with a covering of badgers' skins, and shall put them on a bar.' (Numb. iv. 2.) And this was done for the reason which is added—that no one 'shall touch any holy thing, lest they die.' (Ver. 15.) The bearers of the holy vessels, therefore, saw none of those things which they carried, but only felt the weight of them, for the covering of blue concealed everything from their eyes. And just in the same way every one who has wholly dedicated himself to God is most sweetly ignorant, and does not so much as desire to know why this or that is permitted or commanded by God. Whatever the burden may be, he takes it on willing shoulders. It is enough for him to see the burden concealed by the blue veil, that is to say, clothed with the Divine will."—Pp. 81, 82.

The one great truth which shines out clearly from this good man's personal experience, as recorded in these pages, is the perfect peace, the utter destruction of all evil, which follows an entire conformity to the will of God. The simple-minded Father rises to a power of expression which is almost sublime in striving to prove the certainty of this rest in true and willing submission to his wayward fellow creatures; and perhaps we cannot better commend the book to our readers than by transcribing the following passage for their benefit.

"S. Bernard, illustrious among the faithful servants of God, long ago proclaimed, in words as few as they are clear, in what way the fire of hell may very easily be extinguished. These are his words (Serm. 3, de Resur. Dom.):—'Let there be an end of your own will, and there will be no such thing as hell.' And he assigns the following forcible reason:—'For what does God hate or punish but one's own will? Against what will hell-fire rage, but against one's own will? Even now, when we suffer from cold or hunger, or any such thing, what is injured but our own will? But, if we voluntarily endure these things, there is then a community of will established (that is to say, between God Who sends such things, and man who endures them). Moreover, with what fury one's own will fights against the Lord of all Might let those who are the slaves of their own will hear and tremble. For, in the first place, when it becomes its own master, it withdraws and separates itself from the government of Him Whom, as its Author, it is bound by right to serve. But will it be content with this act of injustice? By no means. It adds another still, and, as far as lies in its power, seizes and plucks away by force everything which belongs to God. For what limit does human cupidity propose to itself? Would not the man who gains a trifling sum by lending his money at interest, try in the same way to gain the whole world, if it were not utterly impossible, and if his capacity only equalled his inclination? I affirm, with confidence, that the entire world would not be enough to satisfy a man who is guided by his own will; but how I wish that he would be contented even with that, and would not (horrible to speak of!) vent his rage against the very Author of all things! Thus he becomes like some

cruel animal, the fiercest of wild beasts, the most ravenous of she-wolves, the most savage of lionesses. This is the most loathsome leprosy of soul, on account of which he ought to wash himself in Jordan, and follow the example of Him Who came not to do His Own will. Whence also, during His Passion, He exclaimed,—‘Not My will, but Thine, be done.’ ‘Let one’s own will come to an end, and there will be no hell!’ It is not, therefore, a childish and idle question,—‘Can the flames of hell be extinguished, and in what way?’ They certainly can. They are not vain prayers to ask God to destroy hell. He is ready to do it. He demands but this one thing as the reward for His labour,—‘Let man’s own will come to an end, and there will be no hell!’ But who can so far stimulate all men as that each should surrender his own will, and cause it to rest entirely on the Divine? Do you, my friend, if you are in earnest, do you master your own will, and you have at once removed that place to which you would otherwise have been bound, and where you would have been tormented in hell, just as much as if hell itself were destroyed, and its flames were extinguished. ‘Let one’s own will come to an end, and there will be no hell.’ ‘The eye,’ says one, ‘is the door and messenger of the heart. Close the eye, and there will be no desire of having. Let the will come to an end, and, lo! hell is closed!’—Pp. 218—220.

Drexelius was a Jesuit, and wrote at the time when the Jansenistic Controversy was at its height. The Bishop of Brechin in vindicating his theology, we observe, expresses a stronger condemnation of Jansenism than his recent Volume of Sermons would have led us to expect from so thorough an Augustinian.

The illustrations, designed by Mr. Alfred Bell, as well as the paper and typography, reflect great credit on the taste and enterprise of the publishers.

RECENT WORKS ON THE PASSION.

1. *The Passion and Temptation of our Lord.* A Course of Lectures delivered at All Saints', Margaret Street, in Lent, 1862. To which is added a Sermon preached at S. Giles', Oxford, in the same Lent. By the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Rector of Clewer.
2. *Meditations on our Lord's Passion.* Translated from the Armenian of Matthew, Vartabed. By the Rev. S. C. MALAN, M.A., Vicar of Broadwindsor.
3. *The Pocket Book of Daily Prayers.* Translated from Eastern Originals. By the Rev. S. C. MALAN, M.A., Vicar of Broadwindsor.

THE above works on the Passion and Temptation of our LORD have been very appropriately published at this season by Mr. Masters. Mr. Carter's book, as might have been expected, is of the very highest order of devotional writing; and the more deeply the mind has become spiritualised by communion with God, the more intensely will such a work be appreciated. So profound a comprehension of the mental sufferings of our LORD, so vivid a realisation of the awful anguish of soul, which is, in its infinitude, beyond all human thought, could only have been gained in long protracted vigils, and in a life of prayer and self-discipline, such as very few can attain to in this busy restless world. The wonderful detail with which, by some secret instinct, this author has learnt to describe the interior tortures of the Incarnate God, will, therefore, be only understood or welcomed in proportion as the reader has followed the same high and difficult path to the attainment of Divine wisdom. To the generality of readers it will seem occasionally overwrought and hyperbolic. One of the charges brought against Catholic writers in the present day, by the new school of "free inquirers," is that of overlaying the plain unvarnished Gospel narrative with a multitude of exaggerations, and assuming various interpretations and suppositions which the Sacred Text will not warrant; and there is no doubt that such positive affirmations as this book, in common with all meditative treatises, contains on the interior movements of our LORD's mind, have no foundation in any recognised authority. But this is no valid ground of objection to such writers. The *verum* is not what they profess to give, but the *verisimile*. It is simply then a question of the competency of an author; and for ourselves we should be content with believing in respect to any work of one who has given such proof of his ministry, that the promise will be fulfilled, "He that *doeth* the will of My FATHER shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

The following extract from Mr. Carter's really wonderful description of our LORD's agony, shows very remarkably his power of realising details which revelation has only sketched in outline :

"The text marks the time when, notwithstanding the long preparation, and the clear foreknowledge, now in the immediate preparation for the last Sacrifice, His Soul experienced an overpowering sense of oppression, a sinking as of Death taking possession of the organs of life, when the broken Heart gave way, the Sacred Humanity sank exhausted and prostrate upon the earth.

"There was in our LORD a true union between the Manhood and the Godhead ; but there was no such imparting of the Godhead to the Manhood, as to make the Manhood more than man, or cause it to be untrue to say, that the Manhood endured alone what He endured, as the Manhood alone could die, and alone be overwhelmed in that exhaustion and excess of anguish. It would be a confusion of the two natures, to suppose that the Godhead communicated to the Manhood what did not properly belong to a created nature. The Word imparted what He willed to the new nature which He took, but He took our nature in the truth of its substance ; and in order to be like unto His brethren, He bound Himself to its appointed laws and essential conditions. As our LORD hungered and wept, and was wearied, in the truth of such natural human infirmities, no intervention of His Godhead changing their character, or diminishing their force, even so the Agony of His Soul and the pain in His Flesh, were the true sufferings of a true Manhood, undiminished by their mysterious union with GOD, the very mystery of which consisted in preserving the distinctness of the two combined natures in the Oneness of the Personality.

"The language in which the dreadful conflict in Gethsemane is described speaks of the deepest possible oppression of the inward life. S. Mark says, 'He began to be sore amazed,' the original word implying an overpowering terror, as in the presence of something startling from its strange aspect of horror, causing a manifest shuddering and recoil ; 'and to be very heavy,' a term indicating the complete oppression and distress of the living energies of the soul, as though life were exhausted by its excess of anguish. It is S. Luke who uses the term 'Agony,'—'being in an Agony,' a convulsion of fear and amazement, as of one suddenly seized, struggling for life, a grappling with some terrible power ; and in this Agony 'He prayed more earnestly,' or with extreme intensity of fervour, as for instant relief in the uttermost extremity of need and distress.

"The Evangelists describe our LORD's actions in that terrible hour, and they correspond with the words which speak of the extremity of convulsion and distress passing within the Soul. The clinging to the three disciples, thus apparently manifesting a desire for their companionship, and their sympathy ; then the 'being withdrawn,'—the original word is much stronger, being 'rent, or torn away as by force,'—from them ; then the going forward and falling on His knees in prayer ; then the return to the disciples, and finding them neglectful of their charge and asleep ; the going away again to prayer, and again returning ; this going to and fro three several times ; the same rising

up and going and returning; these fluctuations of movement, as though He found not rest or relief for His oppressed horror-stricken Soul,—show the same mysterious, most marvellous tossings to and fro of convulsed emotions. Then the words of His prayer,—‘If it be possible, let this hour pass from Me;’ ‘Abba, FATHER, all things are possible to Thee;’ ‘Take away this cup from Me, nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt;’ ‘Not My will, but Thine be done;’—express the same conflict of profoundest emotions, the possibility of escape realised, yet only to be renounced; the two wills of the two natures contrasting one with the other, yet only to become more entirely one; the weaker nature trembling, fearing, recoiling back, but only to be bound more straitly to the stronger; the ‘what I will’ of the frail, exhausted flesh, looking out, desiring relief, but rejected even while giving utterance to its desire, nay, rather, while it rises and seeks for its expression, already anticipated by the denial, ‘Not My will, but Thine.’”—Pp. 43—46.

Lest it should be supposed, however, that this profound appreciation of the mysteries of the Divine Life on earth should unfit the author from treating profitably of the daily realities of our common existence, we conclude with a specimen of his practical teaching, where his counsels, beautiful as they are, will be found within the reach of the most feeble traveller heavenward.

“Our LORD was parting with the disciple who had once failed Him, and He left as His last word, to dwell upon his memory, one lesson which was to shape and determine his whole future course, converted as he was, but not yet perfected. JESUS saith to Simon Peter, ‘Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not.’ Dost thou think that this announcement of the necessity of an ever renounced and yielded will, applies only to the martyr’s death, and not also to the martyr’s life? Read in it, every child of GOD, thy own history through thy whole future, if thou wouldest be CHRIST’S, if thou wouldest ‘crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts,’ if thou wouldest ‘mortify the deeds of the body and live.’ The injunction couched in the parable, implies the being so bound in spirit by the higher will of GOD, that thou, thy lower self, should know no independent inclination of its own, but ever accepting the heavenly call, be carried against its own bias to choose the higher way, though it be the way of suffering.

“Look back along thy early life, and what does the view reveal? Strong passions and frequent yieldings, keen wishes and restless efforts to fulfil them, a determined will, and constant shrinking from control. Look forward, and consider what must thy life be? A pliant will, ever listening for the Divine Voice to determine its action, thy lower nature constrained to yield to thy higher nature, the natural life taught to live for other worlds than this, the future glory, as yet unseen, but embraced as the blessed recompense for wishes mortified, for sacrifices

consummated, for pain, for loneliness, for poverty, for shame, for disappointment, bravely and faithfully endured.

"Let it be thy constant aim to accept this lot cheerfully. Resolve to contend earnestly, and, in the strength of GOD, to overcome, in this wrestling with the inferior will. The first danger of decline from the high standard is in the dwelling overmuch on vivid impressions, or strong feelings which excite the natural apprehensions of the heart; the brooding over fond recollections, or dreams of fancied happiness; the tendency to magnify a real or supposed hardship, to listen to wounded self-love, to call up again and again the grief, the complaint, the regret, the loss, or the fear. These natural workings of the soul are the avenues through which the Tempter seeks to approach the inner life, drawing off the soul from its rest in GOD, and its consciousness of great spiritual realities. Then follows the darkening of the inward light, the loss of the clear shining of the vision of GOD once vouchsafed to the eye of faith, the clouding of the higher faculties of the soul. And in this darkened state doubts and questionings even of the reality of grace, of the love of GOD, of the indwelling of the Divine Nature, of the certainty of the promises and callings of GOD, gather around the soul, depressing its energies, hindering its peace, paralyzing its efforts, undoing the results of many vows and acts of self-dedication, and casting the soul adrift upon a sea of perpetual unrest, and hopeless tossings to and fro without aim and without guidance. Thus the higher will declines, and the inferior nature resumes by degrees something of its original predominance. And then passion, or natural desire, or self-love, or an unsubdued temper, or pride of heart, begins again to rule the servant of CHRIST, the chosen one, the consecrated heir of the kingdom.

"One great secret of safety against such falls—the secret of a true progress in the higher life of supernatural grace—is to be found in the faithful effort to control the inclinations of the will in union with the Divine Presence in the exercise of the lesser duties and calls which form the routine of daily life. In rising up at the appointed hour; in the first prayer; in composing the soul for its first contact with the outer world; in recollection of spirit during casual converse; in bearing annoyances, or infirmities, or unexpected hindrances; in accepting distractions or pressure of work; in self-restraint at meals; in the habitual mortification of act or thought; in the ready charity or self-abasement on slight sudden occasions, which arise continually to test the habitual frame of the soul from early morning till the night returns to recruit and calm the wearied pilgrim of the day,—in these continual efforts there is an unceasing succession of trial, in which the higher will may assert its true sovereignty, its Divine mission. And as every such effort is the subdual of nature to grace, so is it the progressive establishment of the abiding reign of GOD within the soul, the safeguard of its peace, the assurance of future conquests which have their issues in eternity, the preparation for a perfected union with the Almighty Will, to Which all things must bow in heaven and in earth, the reigning of Which is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the HOLY GHOST.

"These continual daily victories tend, through the grace of GOD, to brace and fix the texture of the renewed will, and to form the tone of

mind, in which the call to nobler sacrifices is accepted readily, in which the powers of endurance are matured, and the spirit of devotion deepens, leavening gradually all the movements and issues of the life. To such habitual mastery of the lower nature is specially vouchsafed the gift of a chastened mind, and a clear vision of the Invisible, and a grasp of hidden verities, with the ever growing sense of their substantial reality. Before a soul thus disciplined the future rises as a brightening and expanding vision, to which all the lines of life's deepest interests converge, in which are lost all sensations of fear, or depressions of passing sorrow, the burdens and anxieties of a state which is felt more and more to be the needful discipline of one who is passing from death to life, and in whom at each fresh patient endurance of the appointed trial, death is being 'swallowed up in victory.' "—Pp. 52—55.

While, however, this work will be a most delectable treasure to those—and they are not a few, nor of one school of theology alone—who can enter into its merits, Mr. Malan's translation of the old Armenian's suggestive meditations, will be found a great boon to such as prefer a simpler style of religious writing. The work is full of a touching pathos, and a spirit of deep, unselfish love to the Crucified, which must do much to warm and rouse the large class of Christians, who find themselves stagnate so easily in coldness and oblivion. Prayers to follow each meditation are given at the close, and form perhaps the most useful part of the book.

We infer from Mr. Malan's silence as to the history of the book and its author that he has nothing to say: he might, however, have told us that "Vartabed" means "Doctor," and that the original work, though compiled doubtless from earlier sources, belongs (we believe) to the last century. Also we should have liked to know how much of *adaptation* the editor has allowed himself to use.

We do not know if the same excuse will hold good in regard to the charming little *Manual of Daily Prayers* which has followed in quick succession to the *Meditations*. But here also we very much desiderate information. It is true that the sources from which they are translated are indicated—but in an abbreviated form which few will understand. And further, we should be glad to know whether in the Coptic Offices from which the short Prime, Sext, and Compline, here given, are derived, there is not also a Commemoration of the other "Hours." It is very interesting to note that these Offices are all based on the historical records of the New Testament—a feature which has been entirely lost in the Western Offices.

STEADFASTNESS.

THE last thirty years will prove an eventful period in the history of the English Church. Years flow on in such even course with our lives, and events appear to succeed each other in such natural order, that we do not mark them at the time as stamped with any peculiarity of character; and it is only when at stated times we take a retrospective view of the years that are gone by, that we discover that the days in which we live are different from other times. Great improvements too come not with observation; they make no noise or commotion in the world, and therefore they are apt to be overlooked, whilst little hindrances, which stand in our path, assume an aspect of undue importance. We see now how specially applicable this is to the history of the last thirty years. There were hindrances in the path which seemed to be insurmountable, and yet in looking back on them now, they appear to have been as nothing in the way, whilst God's Truth passed on in its triumphant course, and the weapons, which were formed against it, fell powerless at its side. Nor was this all, for the very weapons which seemed ready to crush the Truth, have, in God's good providence, been turned to the furtherance of His purpose. This is the way in which He deals commonly with His people, and therefore we should not only expect obstacles, but we should not be discouraged when we see them. By contest with evil, the strength of the Christian character is formed. Through persecution, the Church at the first gained victory over the world: the opposition of heretics brought out the mental vigour and deep learning of the great doctors of Christianity; and now in our own times, what has been the effect of the Gorham judgment and the Bath sentence, but to root more deeply in the hearts of the people, the truths they intended to condemn? From these lessons we derive encouragement and hope, but yet they would be lost upon us, if they did not also teach the necessity for *steadfastness* and its reward. Thirty years ago, the prospects of the Church were dark; an age of indolence had deprived the Church of her external vigour, and she had sunk into a lethargy, from which she could never have recovered, if it had not been for the Divine presence within, which, being the source of her life, could reanimate her members. The good old days of George III., were easy days for the Church. Although God had not left Himself without a witness, in that there was always a little band of faithful men, who lamented the evils of their days, and looked for better times: the majority of the clergy satisfied themselves with the barest attention to their sacred duties, and for the rest were the sportsmen, the men of letters and the boon

companions of their day. The population increased, and the oversight of the flock was neglected, and what wonder was it, that men of earnest minds, who had separated themselves from the Church, took in hand the work which she had left undone. Thus dissent spread through the length and breadth of the land, and found a position unoccupied, where she might take her seat, not only in the mountains of Wales, but amidst the teeming masses of our rapidly increasing mercantile towns. The question then, naturally arose, "Why should the Church retain her temporal possessions whilst others did her work ;" and a practical solution of the inquiry was now given by political agitators, men who cared for neither Church nor Dissent, but whose only aim was to uproot the ancient landmarks of the nation. Under such tutorage, Dissenters became politicians, and the avowed enemies of the Church of England.

Meanwhile there had grown up within the Church, a body of Clergymen of earnest devotion, rather than of sound learning, whose sympathies had been drawn out towards Dissenters, by the zeal with which they appeared to be animated. They had seen the influence which the Dissenters had gained over the hearts of the people, as well as the effects which followed the earnestness of their preaching, and therefore, actuated with a desire, which we will not blame, to produce the same results, they adopted into the system of their parochial ministrations, all that could be imitated from the example which they saw. The coldness, with which they were regarded by their more worldly brethren, may have been some excuse for the narrowness of spirit with which they arrogated to themselves the name of Evangelical, as if to them alone the Gospel of CHRIST'S Truth had been committed. Co-operation and sympathy they naturally desired, and when they found that these were refused by those from whom they ought to have received it, they looked more and more to Dissenters as their brethren and allies. In a little time, Dissenters assumed an aspect of political antagonism to the Church, and then the position of the Evangelicals was seen to be unreal and anomalous. They were placed in a difficult position. Some retained their alliance with Dissenters, although they found that they had all to yield and nothing to gain by the coalition ; others withdrew their sympathy from Dissenters, but did not extend it within the pale of the Church. From these causes, it has happened that the Evangelical party no longer exists as a reality ; though the name and tradition have survived its decay, like the toryism to which some elderly gentlemen still profess to adhere. The failure of the Bishop of Norwich's attempt to gather round him an united band of Churchmen and Dissenters, whose bond of concord would be found in the profession of Evangelical principles, is a proof of the entire decay of the old Evangelical party in the Church.

There was a time when the Evangelical party did good service ; it helped in no small degree to awaken life and energy in days of

supineness and inertia. Many amongst the leading members of the Church party have been nurtured amidst its traditions, and look back with respect to those who, half a century ago, incurred persecution and contempt for the boldness with which they rebuked the worldliness that was the prevalent tone of society. A better state of things was however in preparation. When the position of the Evangelicals was discovered to be erroneous, the Church party was already arising to occupy the breach. The inability of the Evangelicals to defend the Church, combined with the dangers that were threatening on every side, led thoughtful men to consider where those defences might be found, behind which they might safely entrench themselves. The study of Church history was resorted to, and men sought out the old paths, and found that the strength of the Church in past days of rebuke had been found, not in state patronage or accidental circumstances, but in the inherent vitality of her own Divine commission. This was the central point from which the revival of Truth, which had stood the test of ages, took its origin, and as the current flowed on, doctrines which had been practically laid aside, were opened out to view with increasing clearness, and the connection between faith and practice was more distinctly seen. There were many hindrances in the way of its progress, but for all these, we may doubtless be thankful; for if the advance had been more rapid, it would not have been so secure.

Principles hastily adopted are apt to be hastily laid aside; but, as things have been, time has been given to weigh every step before it was taken. And what has been the result? The vast increase of the Colonial Episcopate, with all its attendant blessings, and the now universal desire for the multiplication of Bishoprics at home, has resulted from a growing dependence on the Church's first principles as the ground of all success. The prominence given to the doctrine of the Sacraments, in the preaching of the large majority of the clergy, contrasts most favourably with the utter want of definite teaching which was prevalent thirty years ago. The multiplication of Services and the greater frequency of Communion have been a consequence of this; and the revival of the Church's synodal action gives promise that she will not again return to the apathy from which she has been awakened.

Great, however, as has been the progress, we believe that it would have been greater still, if it had not been for a want of steadfastness in those who took part in the movement. This we must point to as the greatest impediment, rather than the opposition of adversaries. Perhaps we ought to have expected it in a movement which has spread over a long series of years; but as the work has gone forward in spite of this, our faith that it is of God is only strengthened and confirmed.

When the Church movement commenced, a beautiful vision

seemed to float before the eyes of many an enthusiastic and zealous spirit ; but when the dream was not immediately realized, their hearts sank within them. Impediments really providential, were misinterpreted, and proved a stumbling-block in their path ; and instead of working on in faith, some deserted the altars of the English Church, and joined themselves to the communion of Rome. They seemed to have forgotten that in the fourth century the faith of the Church was not settled without a contest and a struggle, in which heresy was often uppermost for a time, as Amalek prevailed when the hands of Moses were laid down. The oppression of Catholic truth and the persecution of its adherents was, however, all the time preparing the way for its final victory : and unreasonable it was to suppose that such would not befall us, when the nation was beginning to arise from her lethargy, and to rear again the ensigns of the Church's ancient faith.

And now, alas for the steadfastness of man ! one who had comforted many a doubting heart by relating the varied fortunes of the Church in the fourth century, was himself amongst the number of deserters. His example was followed by many who had placed their trust more upon a person than on the inherent vitality of the Church ; and what was the result ? Not only were the labours of useful and zealous men lost to the English Church, but suspicion was naturally cast on the motives of those who remained, and the Protestant feeling of England was aroused to blind madness. It was hard to persuade the people that the Church movement had not a Romeward tendency, when some of the more prominent leaders had deserted the cause which they once ably vindicated. Now therefore arose a fresh trial for steadfastness to endure. Some were perplexed at the first result, and drew back from the contest altogether. Others held their ground ; but the prejudices with which they had to contend appeared insurmountable, and by imperceptible degrees their zeal abated.

Prejudice against the Church party was the cause of many a discouraging blow from those in high places, and at each one the steadfastness of some deserted them. It was a juncture which required the wisdom of the serpent, combined with the harmlessness of the dove ; but, unhappily, these did not always go hand-in-hand. The wisdom of the serpent was too often manifested in the surrender of principle, and the harmlessness of the dove in want of consideration for ignorance and prejudice, and a tendency to wound the consciences of weaker brethren, who might have been won over to the cause by more judicious treatment.

These last mistakes have long since been seen and most generally rectified ; but there are other impediments which we must, each in our degree, use our influence in removing. The poetic age and the martyr-age of revived Catholicity have alike passed away ; and the Church's work, therefore, to many minds,

will seem less attractive than it was twenty years ago. But it is quite as real and important work, we are persuaded, which remains to be done, and is beset with perils which are quite its own.

(1.) When a Bishop can assail the veracity of Holy Scripture, and Professors in our Universities can openly teach a modified scepticism; when the bulwarks of the Church are sought to be undermined by relaxing subscription to her formularies; and when the State enjoins that which the Church forbids; these are no days to sit at ease, but to be up and doing in that steadfast contest by which the victory of faith shall be obtained.

The Church has certainly known similar days before, and has survived the dangers which impended. Bishops have been avowed heretics, and even professed infidels. The State has before now demanded the surrender of principles, which have been resolutely defended by confessors. Such steadfastness we need now; but did the dangers present themselves in a less insidious and specious form, we should have less apprehension as to the result.

(2.) Another danger—against which we look for aid from the English Church Union and kindred institutions, if prudently conducted—lies in the course and tendency of Legislative enactment in the British Parliament, and in the tone of public opinion generally.¹ And perhaps the best lesson in the art of dealing with this danger may be learnt from the career of S. Athanasius. In him we see that zeal tempered by charity, which, under God's blessing, rendered him the master of his age. One steadfast aim and purpose shone through every action of his life, and yet the secret of his success lay in the power which he possessed of dealing with men,—in his genial sympathies, and his charity towards those by whom the truth was but imperfectly perceived. He was kindly in his judgments of Liberius, Hosius, and the Council of Ariminum, and he could make allowance for the difficulties of the semi-Arians, and recognize their real brotherhood with himself. He was no less an example of charity than of firmness, and it was by the union of these two qualities that he succeeded in leading the minds of all those who came within the range of his influence. His aim was to establish God's truth, and not to impose his own definitions, or to exact the shibboleth of a party, even although that party was his own. And it is just such a disposition which we in the present day most chiefly need: an undaunted firmness in the defence of truth, united to a charity, which will lead men to the faith, instead of a

¹ It is not generally known, we believe, that the sceptical party in Oxford has for some years devoted itself systematically to influencing the public press, and that now most of the weekly papers and two or three of the chief daily papers are practically in their hands. Dr. Stanley, it is well known, writes both in the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*. It is unnecessary to specify other magazines which avowedly represent their opinions.

narrowness of view, which can make no allowance for imperfect perceptions of Catholic truth. Unfed by a life of devotion, the courage of the great Athanasius could not have been as undaunted as it was. He knew, after the example of his Divine Master, how to seize occasions, as well as how to deal with men, and therefore his influence was never retarded by ill-timed or misplaced acts of zeal.

A case has just now occurred to which the principles on which S. Athanasius acted are we think, not inapplicable.

For reasons of state the marriage of the Prince of Wales was appointed to take place in Lent. Her Majesty was graciously pleased to express her permission for the postponement of public rejoicings until after Easter. The feeling of the people was, however, strongly in favour of keeping the marriage day as one of national jubilee. As Lent itself was an ecclesiastical appointment, the Bishops no doubt possessed a dispensing power with respect to one day in this penitential season; and we think that they did not do amiss in yielding to the desire of the nation. And yet there were some clergymen who found it irreconcilable to their conscience to join in the festivities of the marriage day. We greatly respect their motives, but are inclined to think that it was an occasion of influence for the Church which S. Athanasius would not have omitted to use. It was not for us to judge of the reasons of state which necessitated the hastening of the royal marriage. The Archbishop of Canterbury was satisfied, and that might in such a case have been sufficient. The loyalty of the people which broke out into enthusiasm throughout the length and breadth of the land was in itself a healthy sign, and to abstain from rejoicing would have needlessly given offence and brought suspicion on our own loyalty.

We were sorry that the marriage was appointed for this time, and still more that a Friday in Lent was selected for the royal bride's first reception at S. James's. It indicates a disregard, perhaps, of holy seasons in high places, but as there was a use to be made of the event, we had opportunity of teaching lessons of loyalty, and of showing the Church in her true position as the guide of the nation's enthusiasm, and the sympathiser in all the people's joys and sorrows, as well as of reminding the people that when the festivities of the marriage day were over, there were other and more important duties to which they must return, and that in the homage which they paid to earthly princes, that which they owed to God must not be forgotten. This, we think, is the use which S. Athanasius would have made of the occasion.

We may remember likewise the struggle between Justina and S. Ambrose, when the Portian Basilica at Milan was demanded for the Arians. It was not only the act, but the whole conduct of the great Confessor which is instructive. His dutiful loyalty was no

less remarkable than his firm resistance. If Sir Morton Peto's Bill, which was rejected in the last session of Parliament, should ever become law, the clergy may learn from S. Ambrose the spirit in which they should protect their heritage. Such a resistance would prove, we believe, no less efficacious now than it did at Milan in the fourth century ; and even as we are at present circumstanced, trials of our steadfastness may be made. Clergymen may be called on in contravention to the canons of the Church to perform marriage rites between persons whom a civil tribunal has separated from those who are still in the eyes of God and of the Church their lawful husbands and wives. Marriage is indissoluble by the Divine ordinance, and Bishops have not the power, even if they had the will, to dispense with the laws of God. When such occasions arise, opportunity for the manifestation of steadfastness will be given. The law protects clergymen from civil penalties, but it is doubtful whether this protection extends to those who have been ordained since the passing of the act. At any rate, there is popular clamour, if not civil penalties, to be endured, and we trust that in such emergencies the spirit of S. Ambrose may be aroused amongst us again. It was into such a snare that Archbishop Laud once fell ; but his repentance remains as a warning for future ages, since it was not without reason that the anniversary of the commission of his sin was observed throughout the later years of his life as a day of solemn humiliation.

True steadfastness is not party-spirit, for it is always attended with charity and moderation. It is shown in a steady aim, never laid aside nor forgotten, although it may often "bide its time"—not through fear of persecution or love of ease, but in the endeavour to overcome prejudices and make the vantage ground secure. The truly steadfast man will first be steadfast in his prayers, and the steadfastness of his devotional habits will cast its halo over all the actions of his life. Steadfast in the faith, he will lose no opportunity of inculcating its holy truths, not by bitter words against those who oppose themselves, but in the spirit of S. Paul who made himself all things to all men, that by all means he might save some.

We do not mean for a moment that the truth is to be compromised, or that institutions, founded on right principles, should be discouraged on account of the prejudice which may exist against them ; but that steadfastness should be shown in the endeavour to remove these prejudices, and to act in wisdom towards them that are without. And yet, on the other hand, the danger of the present day seems rather to lie in too great an assimilation of our habits and tone to the low standard which is current around us. Against this danger the chief remedy is that steadfastness of purpose which will protect us from this weakening influence, when we hold intercourse with those whose aim and whose standard of de-

votion is lower than our own. If we maintain this steadfastness, there will be little danger of our being drawn into the vortex of popular opinions, either in belief or practice, and therefore we shall be able to make our influence felt over a wider surface without peril to ourselves.

After all, it is the quiet, even, and consistent course, which in the long run wins success; and the Church cause is promoted by many whose names are never heard in connection with the controversies of the day, as effectually perhaps as by the most learned divines and the ablest defenders of the faith. Each one of us has received his own gift, and his care must be to use it in steadfastness, looking for the fruit of his labour, though he wait long for it, and his patience may be often tried.

Time was when the hearts of many failed them, as sitting alone in their country parsonages, they mourned over the decayed vitality of the Church. Isolation and want of sympathy undermined their steadfastness, and their trial was one of no light degree; but now the need has suggested the remedy, and the remedy answers to the need. Church congresses, clerical retreats, and even, in their own sphere, decanal synods, are drawing together our sympathies, and we are learning to help each other by mutual conference and united action.

Our lot is not cast beneath a cloudless sky. Some dark shadows which fell upon us have dispersed, but other clouds are gathering in the horizon. Yet if our aims are not dissipated through want of steadfastness, we need not fear the evil. God is with us, and using our instrumentality to work His purpose, and if we will give ourselves to the task with undivided hearts, our reward shall be to see the fruit of our labours in the increased energy which the Church shall put forth in the establishment of the faith, in the overthrow of heresy, and in the multiplication of her works of mercy.

(3.) But there is yet, we feel, a danger far more to be dreaded than either of these two. It is a danger arising from within, rather than from without. We allude to the great advance of secularity and self-indulgence among the younger clergy. It is now no uncommon thing to hear of men recently ordained dancing, and hunting, and mixing without reserve in all those sports which the *muscularists* have succeeded so widely in popularizing. We have no puritanical aversion to youthful enjoyment, but when we look at the immense increase of expensiveness¹ in our Universities during the last few years, and the general progress of luxury among all classes, unless the clergy offer a strong resistance it will be impossible for them as a body, we are persuaded, to maintain their proper spirituality of mind. The observance of daily prayer and frequent Communion, a distinctive clerical dress,

¹ It is calculated that at Oxford this has increased by one fifth.

and the keeping aloof from all places of general amusement, seem to us indispensable safeguards to the sacerdotal character; and unless the oncoming generation of Catholic and orthodox clergy will keep firm to these principles, we very much fear that Dissent or Evangelicalism will speedily reappear in the ascendant. The course which our Bishops have taken on the subject is peculiarly unfortunate. The Bishop of Rochester could scarcely be expected to take anything beyond the mere puritanical line, but looking to the prominent position occupied by the Bishop of Oxford in the public eye, it is very much to be regretted that he should on several occasions have propounded lax views on this subject. The increasing secularity of his Lordship's own University will speedily cause him to change his opinions. But the mischief we fear is already done.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Holiness of Beauty; or the Conformation of the Material by the Spiritual—Christian Idealism. By W. CAVE THOMAS. London: F. S. Ellis.

PERHAPS if we were more intimately acquainted with "Christian Idealism," than we can profess to be, we might find more in it to condemn than we are aware of. As at present advised, however, it seems to us to be based on an undeniable truth, though Mr. Thomas is certainly much in error in supposing that it is the discovery of himself or his friends. We doubt not also, that, like all hobbies, it will be pressed rather too hard by its riders.

The following is Mr. Thomas' account of that theory or system, which is "to mend, to heal, and is to restore nature to wholeness:"

"Christian Idealism, then, substitutes the scheme of physical renovation for the present vague notions associated with the word *progress*, which, as far as any statement can be made of its meaning, would appear to signify an endless accumulation of facts, and the application of machinery to locomotion and manufactures; but it is possible for this kind of progress to continue simultaneously with the spiritual decadence of man. Science applied with no higher motives than these, is that self-sufficient, vain knowledge condemned by Scripture; and if this kind of knowledge be power, it is but mere brute force: whereas the progress which Idealism advocates is a Christian progress—a reconciliation of the material to the spiritual, as in '*the pattern*,' the example of the perfect combination of the two natures in CHRIST. Can there be anything worthier the name of *progress* than the march of humanity towards spiritual and physical rectitude, the realisation of the beautiful in soul and body—*mens sana in corpore sano*?"—P. 6.

The most successful application of the principle is, undoubtedly, (1) to Art, as against the Pre-Raphaelites; and (2) to History, as against

the modern school of historians, who, laying hold of some unimportant fact or anecdote which they have exhumed from contemporary memoirs, proceed to generalise upon it by the widest possible deductions, and fancy that they are building on a sure foundation!

We will again give the author's own words, and with them will commend the book to the perusal of all speculatists:

"The naturalists, or individualists in art, affect a microscopic rendering of nature, beyond ordinary powers of vision; but it is beyond human skill to imitate the minutiae of vital organisms. Art may pretend to represent each leaf upon a tree—each blade of grass in a field—each hair upon a head; but it is but pretence. The microscope discloses minutiae on minutiae in organic being, whereas a very slight magnifying power applied to imitative art discloses the imposture. Microscopic minuteness is not within the province of the highest order of painting and sculpture. Man's proper work is of a different character. It is his duty to rule and work by general laws—to be perfected spiritually and physically—to moderate, to reconcile other nature to that which his advanced and more comprehensive knowledge approves.

"It may be interesting and instructive to inquire how this pursuit of the individualities of nature by art has assumed importance, and threatened at times to extinguish all desire for ideal excellence. This may be attributed in a great measure, perhaps, to that ambiguity of the words *nature* and *truth*, which leads men unwittingly to cheat themselves, and others, that truthfulness to the nature of individual facts or instances is the all-in-all of pictorial or plastic art.

"Questions like the following are frequently asked:—'What ought to be the sole inquiry with every man who takes to himself, or deserves from others, the designation of philosopher?' Should not the exclusive question be, and should not the answer to it be sought with equal simplicity and earnestness of purpose—'What is Truth?' What other object can there be, of aught that is entitled to be called philosophy, but the discovery of Truth? Of what conceivable use or value are all the investigations and reasonings of philosophy, if not for ascertaining Truth?

"But who, in assenting to these questions, has not felt their vagueness, or found the thread of his inquiry soon entangled; or has not, for a time at least, given up all hope of solving the question, 'What is Truth?' But had the equivalent and more explicit word for the kind of truth implied in those questions been substituted, they would have gained simplicity. The question of paramount importance to mankind is, 'What is right in thought, act, and being?' Truths are infinitely various, but in every species of phenomena there is but one right; and this it is which scientific idealism seeks to determine, and which revelation declares.

"The same kind of entanglement of thought takes place when it is asked, 'What, in the name of common sense, has a man to do but to think and act in conformity to nature?' Now to think and act in *conformity to nature* may include *fallen nature*, which is certainly not his duty. The question is not sufficiently definite. The word *nature* ought to have been qualified or connoted as '*right nature*;' it would then have been tantamount to asking, 'Whether to think and act righteously, according to that nature which Revelation and Reason declare to be the best, be not the whole duty of man?' This is a definite question, to which unreserved assent may be given.

"The word *truth* may, as commonly used, sometimes include every possible fact, imitation, or relation of a fact; at other times exclude from its meaning all but the right, the perfect, the beautiful. In like manner, too, the word *nature* may often mean the everything that has been, is, or is possible to be, and as often only that *some* nature which is according to right reason—nature in its best and perfect conditions. In conversation and argu-

ment these shifting significations of the words *nature* and *truth* are lost sight of. The qualification which should limit their application to the *some* is extended to the *all*; and all nature and all truth, by this confusion of language, have come to be considered by some minds as worthy of imitation, whereas it is only the *right* and *best* truth and nature which deserve reiteration and perpetuation. It is through this careless and indiscriminate use of words, and the consequent misconception of the aim and end of human endeavour, that the highest praise has recently been awarded to the minute relation of facts in literature, and to abject imitation in the fine arts. It appears never to have occurred to those who make this award, that the facts themselves may be unworthy; for if the facts related or imitated are wrong, the exactitude of the relation or imitation makes them no better. The difference between the individualist and the idealist is this: the latter knows the importance of defining terms, and of discriminating between the transient and the essential or normal conditions of phenomena."—P. 210—213.

On Want of Clergy : its Causes, and suggestions for its Cure. A Sermon, preached before the University of Oxford, by the Rev. T. E. ESPIN, B.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Queen's College, Birmingham, &c. J. H. Parker.

THIS Sermon belongs to a class of publications which, in spite of the writer's intentions being good, and though containing many valuable suggestions, does really deserve the gravest censure. We know what would be thought of a soldier, who let the besieging enemy know that they would not be able to hold out much longer. And this is in some degree the line taken by Mr. Espin. For himself he is quite satisfied with things as they are; and yet he counsels the Church to give up the Subscription of Tests.

Perhaps some of our readers may not know what the state of things in Oxford now is. The sceptical party are trying to avail themselves of a dearth in the supply of Clergy, in order to make people believe that the rising generation are declining Tests. There is not the least ground for any such a surmise; neither would persons who decline the very moderate Tests which the Church of England imposes be worth having. It is surely not surprising, if we reflect for a moment, to find that there is a falling off of Clergy. The Universities, we know, are sending men in large numbers to the Indian, the Civil, and the Military Service; and no increase has taken place in the capacities of the various Colleges. Two other causes have also conspired to produce the dearth of Clergy. Parliament has long since cut down those attractive sinecures, for which Sydney Smith and men of his stamp were so jealous. And now this same sceptical party has contrived, to a considerable extent, to quench the spirit of faith and religion in the Church, which for some years have more than compensated for the loss of pluralities and canonries. But still there is no reason to doubt the elasticity of the Church. The supply will soon adapt itself to the demand, as already in Oxford Colleges are beginning to erect new buildings. But besides this, the Bishops have really the remedy in their own hands. It is absurd, while this acknowledged pressure exists, that they should remain immovable in their traditions in respect of

Literates. Within our own limited experience as many as three Bishops have refused so much as to see a candidate who was well recommended to them; and so they prefer Cures-going unserved, to departing from a rule of their own creation. By all means let them keep up as high a standard as they can: but this is not the present question; for the opening the door of the ministry to really good candidates, wheresoever found, would tend to keep up the standard; whereas the giving a monopoly to such very imperfectly constituted places of education as S. Bee's and S. Aidan's, effectually lowers it.

Now in this state of things for anyone who calls himself a High Churchman, to come forward and counsel a change that would permanently alter the constitution of the Church and Universities, is just to play into the hands of the Liberal party. There is nothing they desire so much as to create a panic, by which they hope to profit; and this is the tendency of this very ill-advised Sermon.

We can give a most thorough and hearty commendation to the *Church Times* (Palmer, Great Queen Street). It is a great fact, that we possess at length a penny weekly Church paper, and it is one on which we may still more congratulate ourselves, when that paper is well written and well edited. The Scylla and Charybdis of Church periodicals in these days are, grumbling and puffing—which some contrive most marvellously to combine in one. These have been both avoided hitherto by the "*Church Times*," whose tone has been both instructive and encouraging. We need scarcely say, that nothing but an enormous circulation can remunerate the adventurous proprietors.

The Union Review is another new periodical, published every alternate month, which affects to step into the shoes of the extinct "*Union*" newspaper. It has avoided hitherto some of its predecessor's faults, and the second number is better than the first. But it is still very defective in power; and a writer always harping on one subject can hardly expect a better reception than a man who has but one topic of conversation. For the reader, too, we doubt if it is safe.

The Monthly Reading, (Mozley,) has reached a second volume, and certainly no Church periodical contains more solid materials.

Without endorsing every word that the Dean of CANTERBURY says, in his Sermon on the Marriage of the Prince of Wales, we quite approve of its general tone. The Church was quite right to protest emphatically against the season chosen for that event; but to attempt to stop the current of a nation's rejoicings at such a time appears to us to have been as foolish as it was wrong. Another good, because inoffensive, Sermon, in reference to the same occasion, has been published by Mr. INGLE, of Exeter (Masters).

The fact that several of the Bishop of OXFORD's *Sermons preached before the University of Oxford*, (J. H. Parker,) have received a separate publication, will scarcely, we apprehend, detract from the desire to possess the volume, which will be felt by so many who have been privileged to read one or other of them in that shape. The date of their delivery ranges from 1847 to 1862; and few of the public events of the day are left untouched by the preacher.

Minnie's Birthday, and other Stories for Children, (Masters,) is a very good collection of little tales, written in an excellent tone. They do not contain much definite religious teaching, but such as there is is quite unexceptionable; and there is enough of indirect teaching to render this work useful to little children. There are four pleasing illustrations to embellish the book.

The unscrupulous way in which the Commissioners (or Bishop Baring) propose to deal with the recent foundation of Durham University, in the very lifetime of some of its Founders, has roused "a quondam Fellow" to propose that the funds should be given to the re-establishing of "Durham College" in Oxford, which Henry VIII. destroyed. We cannot wonder at the proposal, though perhaps a hardier faith would believe that the spirit of S. Cuthbert would eventually triumph over the faithlessness of his unworthy successor. The pamphlet, which well deserves attention, is published by Messrs. Saunders and Otley.

Dr. PEILE discovered, it appears, a new interpretation of a certain portion of Holy Scripture, as he supposes, in the week before Quinquagesima, put it forth in the pulpit on Sunday, and sent it to Messrs. Rivingtons to print at the request of his congregation, who thought what was new must be good, on Monday. We cannot say that such a condition of things inspires us with confidence, at the same time we can truly say that this is much less objectionable than some other of the Author's views which we have met with.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON THE OBSERVANCE OF VIGILS.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

SIR,—X. Y. Z., it appears to me, replied sufficiently to himself when he admitted that the Festival begins with the First Vespers of the Eve. With regard to modern Roman Catholics he would be nearer the mark, I think, if he had said that they observe no Vigils. In the "Golden Manual" four Festivals alone are said to have Vigils, "with Fasts of obligation annexed to them."

May I add, that in working out a system of Church principles for ourselves, which shall be something more than a mere paper-theory, it seems to me necessary, as regards ritual and all other features of outer-Church life, to be of primary importance that those who undertake the office of direction should be capable of exercising some discretion, and not act merely as blind antiquarians. It is on this principle, as distinct from eclecticism, I apprehend, that the "Churchman's Diary" has been constructed.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

A PRIEST.

STANLEY'S LECTURES ON THE EASTERN CHURCH.

Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. Second edition. London: Murray. Oxford: J. H. and James Parker. Pp. 525.

PROFESSOR STANLEY is certainly a remarkable man. Every step of his advancement in life has been legitimately made, and has been due to his own merits, to his indefatigable industry, to his extreme brilliancy of parts. He has stood prominently before the world since the time that he wrote the *Life of Arnold* and held the Tutorship of his college: as a Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the most enlightened University in the world, his lecture-room is crowded, and his admirers are many and firm. If we do not join in the popular acclamation it is not because we do not recognise and very highly estimate Professor Stanley's great gifts, his beautiful diction, his appropriate imagery, his marvellous word-painting, his life-description of persons and places,—and perhaps above all, his most happy facility for bringing together things new and old,—people and localities long separated the one from the other, each having their value enhanced ten-fold by their juxtaposition. S. Paul's comparison of the ministry of CHRIST and of Moses for example, (2 Cor. iii.) is illustrated by Dr. Stanley not after the ordinary and conventional treatment of such solemn subjects, but he says:

"There rises into view the figure of Moses as he is known to us in the statue of Michael Angelo; the light streaming from his face, yet growing dim and dark, as a greater glory of another revelation rises behind it." "The same figure veiled; as the light beneath the veil dies away, and shade rests upon the scene, and there rises round him a multiplication of that figure, the Jews in their synagogues *veiled* as the Book of the Law is read before them." "The same figure of Moses once more, but now unveiled, as he turns again to Mount Sinai, and uncovers his face to rekindle its glory in the divine presence: and now again the same figure multiplied in the Apostle, and the Corinthian congregation following him all with faces unveiled and upturned towards the light of His presence, the glory streaming into their faces with greater and greater brightness as if borne in upon them by the spirit or breath of light from that Divine countenance, till they are transfigured into a blaze of splendour like unto it."—Stanley, *Corinth*. Vol. II. p. 79.

VOL. XXV.—MAY, 1863.

2 E

So graphic a picture as this must long retain its hold upon the mind, and be identified with Moses and the veil for a long time to come. This is only one sample from many others which might be taken from Dr. Stanley's Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians, which is allowed upon all sides to be the poorest production that has proceeded from his fertile pen, saving always his Sermon on the Apostolic Epistles. In his preface to the same work, following Dr. Arnold, Dr. Stanley compares the style of S. Paul with that of Thucydides and Oliver Cromwell,—a comparison which reveals at once one of Dr. Stanley's characteristics :

"In all three there is a disproportion between thought and language, the thought straining the language till it cracks in the process—a shipwreck of grammar and logic as the sentences are whirled through the author's mind—a growth of words and thoughts out of and into each other, often to the utter entanglement of the argument which is framed out of them."

Again, in his history of Palestine, speaking of the vineyards, Dr. Stanley sees in the vine the national badge of Judah, and traces it out on the coins of the Maccabees; "in the colossal cluster of golden grapes which overhung the porch of the sacred temple," (what time is included between the commencement and the end of the sentence!) "and the grapes of Judah still mark the tomb-stones of the Hebrew race in the oldest of their European cemeteries at Prague." (Sin. Palest. p. 163.) Elsewhere Dr. Stanley has described the Councils of the Church as great battle-fields: in the present volume he says of the Holy Ecumenical Council of Nice:—

"It was the earliest great historical event so to speak which had affected the whole Church since the close of the Apostolic age. In the two intervening centuries there had been many stirring incidents, two or three great writers, abundance of curious and instructive usages. But all was isolated and fragmentary. Even the persecutions are imperfectly known. We are still in the catacombs. Here and there a light appears to guide us; here and there is the authentic grave of a saint and a martyr, or the altar or picture of a primitive assembly; but the regular course of ecclesiastical history is still waiting to begin, and it does not begin till the Council of Nicæa. Then for the first time the Church meets the empire face to face. The excitement, the shock, the joy, the disappointment, the hope of the meeting, communicate themselves to us. It is one of those moments in the history of the world which occur once and cannot be repeated. It is the last point whence we can look back on the dark broken road of the second and third centuries of which I had just spoken. It is the first point whence we can look forward to the new and comparatively smooth and easy course which the Church will have to pursue for two centuries, indeed, in some cases, for twelve centuries onwards. The line of demarcation between the Nicene and the ante-Nicene age, is the most definite that we shall find till we arrive at the invasion of the barbarians."—P. 66.

There are many other very happy touches in the volume before us: the Koran is described as "the childish invention of the Arabian Nights let loose upon the unseen world." (P. 280.) The Patriarch Nikon is called "the Russian Chrysostom," his story being "as full of dramatic complexity and pathetic interest as was ever concerned in Timon of Athens or King Lear." (P. 349.) On the paschal controversy, Dr. Stanley writes, "On the one side were the old historical apostolical traditions, on the other side the new Christian Catholic spirit, striving to part company with its ancient Jewish birthplace." (P. 154.) In the Introductory Lectures the same happy expressions abound. "The call of Abraham is the first beginning of a continuous growth." Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Solomon, and Elijah, are spoken of as "the goodly fellowship of gifted seers lifting up their strains of joy or sorrow, as they have been well described, like some great tragic chorus, as kingdom after kingdom falls to ruin, as hope after hope dies and is revived again." (P. xxix.) The Jewish history itself "is but the prelude of a vaster and loftier history." Ecclesiastical historians at the end of the first century stand "like travellers on a mountain-ridge, when the river which they have followed through the hills is about to burst forth into the wide plain." At the beginning of the third century the African churches "are the stepping-stones by which we cross from the obscure to the clear; from chaos to order." In Antioch, Alexandria, and around Constantinople, "we may still trace the relics,—the fossilized relics of the old Imperial Church." Mohammedanism was "the great convulsion that has broken the stagnation of the Eastern forms of Christianity;" which Christianity itself "contains only the second act of the drama, it was but the temporary halting-place of the great spiritual migration, which from the day that Abraham turned away his face from the rising of the sun has been stepping steadily westward." (P. xxxix.) The English reformation is spoken of as a "wide shipwreck," out of which the fragments from the vessels were again pieced together. All ecclesiastical history was once regarded as the "valley of the Prophet's visions—strewn with bones, and behold they are very many, very dry, skeletons of creeds, of churches, of institutions, trodden and traversed by feet of travellers, again and again: the scape-goat of one age lying lifeless by the scape-goat of the next." Like "the salt shores of a barren sea, which throws up again dead and withered the branches which the river of life had cast into it, full of beauty and verdure." (P. xlv.) The General Councils of the Church are "the pitched battles of Ecclesiastical History. Ask yourselves the same questions as you would about the battles of military history. Ask when and where, and why, they were fought." (P. l.) "The Prayer Book as it stands is a long gallery of Ecclesiastical History." (P. lix.) "Theology is not above Christianity; the Christian

Church is in many respects the best practical exposition of the Christian religion." (P. lxxv.) "Ecclesiastical History is thus as it were the backbone of Theology." (P. lxxv.) "The whole Christian Church is paved with Scripture texts rightly or wrongly applied, deeply worn by the footsteps of thousands of worshippers. The Psalter alone by its manifold applications and uses in aftertimes, is a vast palimpsest written over and over again, illuminated, illustrated by every conceivable incident and emotion of men and of nations; battles, wanderings, dangers, escapes, death-beds, obsequies of every age and country rise, or may rise to our view as we read it." (P. lxxv.) "Each age of the Church has as it were turned over a new leaf in the Bible and found a response to its own wants. We have a leaf still to turn, a leaf not the less new because it is so old, not the less pregnant with consequences because it is so simple." (P. lxxx.)

We have given our readers these sparkling sayings, culled from Dr. Stanley's writings, to show that we highly appreciate his poetical, flexible, and vigorous language; most of these short extracts are mines out of which he elaborates very much instructive matter: they are the guides to whose following he commits the whole conduct of his lectures. His one great effort and aim is to paint with words—no matter how gaudy the colours used—no matter how distorted—how wilfully distorted some of the subjects are—no matter what anachronisms or false judgments enter into the composition—men gaze at the work, dazzled and confounded. It takes some years of patient study and of imperceptible progress to shake off the erroneous impressions which his delineations of historical characters have left upon the mind. S. Athanasius *literally* did *not* stand against the whole of the Christian world—therefore in a strictly literal sense the Vincentian rule, "*quod semper*," &c., is neither untrue nor inapplicable. (P. lxxix. Lect. vii. p. 236.) We repudiate what some would call Dr. Stanley's great catholicity of sentiment, what we would designate as a shameless laxity in his reverence for the Catholic Church; as a wilful confounding of the mystical body of CHRIST with every feasible form of Antichrist and of schism. Dr. Stanley admires S. Athanasius, for example, very much in the same way as Gibbon admires him; he loves to dwell upon the painful isolation of the saint, upon his contest with the Emperors. While rejecting the idle fable of the Arians about his consecration to the Alexandrian see—a fable so monstrous as to carry its own confutation with it—Dr. Stanley speaks of "the extraordinary and mysterious circumstances, which on any hypothesis attended the appointment of Athanasius." (Lect. vii. p. 226.) Again, "It is not merely as the Egyptian saint, but as the antagonist of the whole Church and empire of the time, that his career has been invested with such singular interest, as that, of all the saints of the early Church, he is the only one who has actually kindled the cold

and critical pages of Gibbon into a fire of enthusiasm." (P. 233.) We object to Dr. Stanley opening and closing his Introductory lectures with quotations from the *Pilgrim's Progress*,—because John Bunyan was one of the bitterest and most turbulent of those sectaries who in bands, aimed at the destruction of all that was truly Catholic in the Church of CHRIST, whether within or without the English branch of that Church. We object to Baxter's Review of his own narrative of his life and times being spoken of as "that admirable summary of mature Christian experience, which ought to be in the hands of every student of Ecclesiastical History—one might well add, of every student of Theology—of every English minister of religion." (P. lxxix.) We do not wish to see praised by an Oxford Professor of Ecclesiastical History "such Nonconformists as Howard, such Quakers as Elizabeth Fry." (Int. p. lxxv.) We say that in the third Introductory Lecture, in the fifth section upon "Better understanding of differences and of unity," (p. lxxi, lxxii.) the most mischievous doctrine is propounded. We deny that wretched saying of the Archbishop of Dublin, that all the varieties of theological division may be traced to the general fallacies latent in every creed and every church. There is a fearful significance in the conclusion at which Dr. Stanley arrives from these miserable premises :

"Pelagius lurks under the mitre of Chrysostom, in the cowl of Jerome, Loyola will find himself by the side of Wesley, John Knox will recognize a fellow-worker in Hildebrand, the austerities of Benedict, the intolerance of Dominic will find their counterpart at Geneva and in Massachusetts, the missionary zeal of the Arian Ulphilas, of the Jesuit Xavier, and of the Protestant Schwartz, must be seen to flow from the same source. The judgment of history will thus far be able to anticipate the judgment of heaven, and to supersede with no doubtful hand the superficial concords and the superficial discords which belong to things temporal by the true separation and the true union which belong to things eternal."—P. lxxii.

The same sentiment was expressed almost in the same words, if not illustrated by the same examples in a volume of sermons which appeared some five years since under the title of *Rational Godliness*, by Dr. Rowland Williams—whose leniency towards every form of heresy and schism is fully shared in by Dr. Stanley. If what is said above be true, if saints and heretics are all one, of the same body, acting under different outward manifestations of that body ; if Arianism and orthodoxy are merely shifting forms of the same fundamental creed, then the Church of God is absolutely nothing at all, there is no visible Church upon earth, there are no priests, no altars, no sacraments, there is no divine commission ; the whole Bible system of salvation which is bound up inseparably from the system of the Church is but one record of human agency, it is both blas-

phemous and a sham when it arrogates to itself a supernatural calling, gifts of grace, and manifestations of God's HOLY SPIRIT.

This is the one radical defect—this is the one plague-spot that mars and renders unwholesome all the productions of Dr. Stanley and his school—it is the humanitarianism of Arnold, in a manner run to seed ; it is the elimination from sacred things, and from holy men of every element of the DIVINE. Doctrine and history, teaching, teachers and councils, are to be clothed with life and colour, but the vesture is to be an earthly clothing, and the colours are those fluctuating tints that gladden and illumine an earthly sky. Disguise the matter how we may, in their commentaries upon several of S. Paul's Epistles, both Professor Jowett and Dr. Stanley aim at accounting for all the wonderful power and truth contained therein by *natural causes* ; words, thoughts, doctrines all can be traced either to some earlier source, or to some accidental circumstances in the history of the apostolic life. In those books there is much that is good and true, and that is very beautiful, but still all is *humanized* : if not in actual dogma, in thought and feeling they are utterly and essentially Arian, and the same spirit is prevalent in these Lectures on the Eastern Church, and in those more recently published upon the Jewish Church. SS. Chrysostom, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen are not saints of the Catholic Church, men sealed by gifts flowing from the Paraclete of the Church, drinking from the fountains of her life, developed by her grace and power. They are simply men, men of ability, of zeal and fervour, men, who acted as other men endowed with equal powers to themselves would have acted under the same circumstances. In this way the councils of the Church are treated. God's promise to be with His Church unto the end of the world, and by His Spirit, is not allowed for at all by Dr. Stanley. He delights to expatiate upon that curious¹ clause in the XXist Article, which states that "general councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes," that they may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God ; but the fact that the HOLY GHOST was present with them, as our Divine Head had promised that He should be, is a fact which slips the lecturer's memory altogether. Dr. Stanley would not allow the Nicene Fathers to apply to themselves the expression "ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν." He would condemn the Anglican Synod of A.D. 1548 for using such words as "which at this time *by the Holy Ghost* with uniform agreement." It is this Dr. Stanley's low, humanitarian view of the Church Catholic which spoils all his lectures, and deprives his forcible and brilliant descriptions of their real charms. Church history taken in itself is no very philosophical or instructive study, its true value is derived from its spiritual lessons, from its bearings upon all that man holds dear, not for this

¹ We mean "curious," as often being misunderstood.

world only, but for the next. The arena of Church controversy is not a conflict only of party with party, nor a balance of power against power, but it is the struggle of eternal truth by which it wins and works its way, but with power from on high, above, and through all the mass of darkness and of sin that lies in so heavy a cloud over this sorrow-stricken world. The history of the Church is indissolubly wound up with the eternal future of our race, it is a history the lowlier and more earthly part of which can only be delineated by us mortals, its greater portion is deposited in the celestial archives, in the records preserved under the throne of God.

After this one great defect, all other faults are but specks in comparison with this one—the mote and the beam. Yet there is another want in Dr. Stanley's writings upon ecclesiastical history, and that is, that to us at least it ever seems as if he had no great love for the study in itself. Christian archæology, Biblical geography, Ecclesiastical biography, all seem more congenial to Dr. Stanley's mind than ecclesiastical history itself. To have laboured at Christian antiquities like De Rossi, or to have written Essays like the late Sir James Stephens, or to have confined his thoughts to investigations such as produced his pleasing but dangerous "Sinai and Palestine," would each have suited him better than his occupying of the Ecclesiastical History Chair at Oxford. True it is that ecclesiastical history embraces all these subjects, and many more, just as geology calls in the aid of many kindred sciences: yet it is not one or another, or a mere mixture of any of them; it uses them all, but it weaves a new whole out of them. It is essentially a history of *dogma*, or of doctrine, if that word be preferred, of dogma supported by a divine tradition, now resisted, now developed, ever winning its way, at different times assumed by men of opposite schools of opinion, by those whose education has been almost antagonistic. Church traditions, creeds, articles of faith, councils and their canons seem utterly alien to Dr. Stanley's mind: he endures them, he treats of them, but it is only upon sufferance. The whole of the outward polity of the Church whether doctrinal, polemical, or ritualistic, is as distasteful to him as anything can well be. You feel it is so while you read his notices of these matters. You feel it too by another very sure test, the pains he is at to escape from these topics as soon as possible. He never lingers lovingly over such ground, but conveys this sort of uneasy sensation to his candid readers, that ecclesiastical dogma, its traditional origin, its subsequent developement, the rites and ceremonies in which it is embodied, is necessary for a well educated man, to know a little about, rather by way of warning than for any notion of present profit, and when once known to be passed by for something of more moment, something possessing more inherent spiritual vitality. We must unhesitatingly affirm that any one reading Canon Stanley's Lectures as his first book upon ecclesiastical history, would arise from its

perusal with a high opinion of the Professor's force and style of writing, and with a very good opinion of the value of ecclesiastical history in general. Ecclesiastical history in these lectures is as much as possible mixed up with civil history, the very *sources* of the former being treated with no ordinary amount of distrust. The following paragraph will explain what we mean.

"We may still lament that the story of the lion is so often told only by the man; that the lives and opinions of heretics can be traced only in the writings of the orthodox; that the clergy have been as often the sole historians of the crimes of the laity. But we shall have learned at least to know that there is another side, even when that side has been torn away or lost. We shall often find some ancient fragment or forgotten parchment like that which vindicates Edwy and Elgiva from the almost unanimous calumny of their monastic enemies. We shall see that in the original biographies of Becket, partial though they be, enough escapes to reveal that he is not the faultless hero represented to us in modern martyrology."—Introduct. p. lv.

We have not space to translate this statement into more explicit language. It would say, You must not be guided by Origen as to what Celsus was; some fragment may yet be discovered, which will show that Origen's morals were very far from being incorrupt, and that Celsus was not the hardened blasphemer that he has been represented. The Manichees were very tolerable people, and the teaching of the sect not so very pernicious: it will not do to view them through the distorted medium of a pervert like Austin. Jovinian was a noble-hearted, anti-superstitious man; as for Jerome's account of him, *that* must be set down to the overflowing bile of the monk of Bethlehem. It is just possible ever to be reading, and ever to be perverting what one reads to suit a preconceived theory. This is very like what Dr. Stanley would advise to be done by the students of ecclesiastical history. Almost worse than this is the advice given us in the Lectures before us to turn the Church's history *against* herself. It is hard quite to understand how many sects Dr. Stanley would regard as so many *churches*. Certainly Lutherans, Wesleyans, Scottish Covenanters, were all members of their several national churches—he seems to extend this appellation indefinitely. Anyhow the Church's history is to be made to bear witness against herself. From this study—

"We learn that every church partakes of the faults as well as of the excellencies of its own age and country, and that each is fallible as human nature itself; that each is useful as a means, none perfect as an end. To find CHRIST or Antichrist, exclusively, in any one community, is against charity, and against humanity; but, above all, against the plain facts of history. Let us hold this truth firmly, and we shall have then secured ourselves against two of the worst of evils which infest the well-being of religious communities, the love of controversy, and the love of proselytising."—Introduct. p. lxxiv.

It is a legitimate inference from this statement, that the Catholic Church is not one but is many Churches; all having some good in them, all having much that is bad: one is as good as another. It is no matter to which a man belongs, only let him stay in the Church in whose communion he was born. All conversion to a standard Church is both pernicious and unprofitable. For Dr. Stanley would regard "Episcopacy" and "ordinations" as certain marks of particular Churches.

There is so marked a parallel between Dr. Stanley's estimate of ecclesiastical history and Dr. Whewell's treatment of Plato, as noticed in a recent number of the "Quarterly Review," (No. 224, Oct. 1862. "The Platonic Dialogues,") that we cannot forbear drawing our reader's attention to it. Dr. Whewell finds that the Dialogues of Plato are most useful for educational purposes, that they contain the germs of a real and true system of morality, that they are the initial and not the final products of this branch of inquiry. The higher order of scholars have found too much in Plato, have treated as integral portions of his writings what he only regarded as accessories; so Dr. Whewell turns the poetry of Plato into prose; he breaks up his most finished and elaborated compositions into a few scholastical definitions and familiar illustrations of an acknowledged truth; he presents us with a lower man than Plato really was; he converts a giant into a pigmy; he loves and reverences Plato, in a sense he popularises him, devotes to him much time and thought, because properly treated Plato is a very useful study for all thoughtful persons—but for Plato as he was, for Plato in all his unrivalled grandeur of conception, in all his more than Attic humour, for his richly developed and glowing poetic fancy, he has neither care nor love. We now quote a remark or two from the article in question:

"It may be, indeed, that his (Dr. Whewell's) endeavours to popularise the 'way of thinking,' known as Greek philosophy is not throughout inspired with the highest reverence for the genius of these writings, which he prizes chiefly for their educational value." He has not "inspired the spirit of the great Athenian;" yet his work presents "many traces of a genuine liking, and *almost* enthusiasm for Plato." "We feel a want in reading him which troubles us more than mistakes of construing. The translator has not sufficient faith in his author. So what Wordsworth says of the poet, applies with at least equal force to the philosopher. 'You must love him, ere to you he will seem worthy of your love.'" "He does not appear to be *quite* an enthusiastic admirer of the Platonic wisdom." "Some part of what lay deepest in Plato, of what he most valued, is thrown into the background, if not ignored."—Quarterly Review, Vol. CXII. Pp. 307—309.

Several other remarks of a like tenor are to be found in the same article, all of which afford the most remarkable coincidences—it would strike a reader of that number of the 'Quarterly,' as he turns

over page after page, that, just the relation in which Dr. Whewell stands to Plato, is that relation in which Dr. Stanley stands to ecclesiastical history: that halting faith, that half enthusiasm, that one-sided view, that eye that fails to discern the true fount of power and beauty—are all so many characteristics which are shared in common by the late Professor of Moral Philosophy, and the present Professor of Ecclesiastical History, towards the special objects of their separate labours. We see that the tone of Ecclesiastical History is lowered by passing through Dr. Stanley's hands; that he does not hold his subject in the same veneration in which his friend Professor Max Müller holds his. (R. Inst., Lect. pp. 23, 25, &c.) He is apologetic where he ought to be dogmatic; he does not side with the Catholic Church, whose path lay through intricate and devious courses. It is enough that any man be arrayed *against* the great body of the Church; that in an age of persecution such an one was persecuted for holding erroneous doctrine, which undeniably merited censure, to enlist Dr. Stanley's sympathies in his behalf. He looks with a grave suspicion upon any dogma which was decreed by a General Council, and its subsequent acceptance, enforced by the strong arm of the secular power. He is a free trader in all matters theological, even in cases where a wholesome restriction would be the best means of preserving a greater purity. Yet Dr. Stanley can be bitter enough in cases in which he takes a dislike. His treatment of S. Cyril of Alexandria, affords a notable illustration of this fact. He, through a mistaken feeling, tries to exalt S. Athanasius at the expense of S. Cyril of Alexandria. Universally, comparisons are odious: in particular cases, as of saint weighed against saint, they are not odious, but bordering upon the profane. The following passage explains what we mean:

“Just as in the history of our own Church, Anselm's virtues can be appreciated only by comparison with Becket, or Ken's by comparison with Sancroft; so Athanasius, in the fourth century, may be fairly judged in the light of his own successor, Cyril of Alexandria, in the fifth. The bribery, which is certainly traced to Cyril, is at least doubtful in Athanasius. There is good reason to acquit Athanasius of any share in the murder of George; but Cyril was suspected, even by the Orthodox, of complicity in the murder of Hypatia. Cyril was active in procuring the cruel banishment of the blameless Nestorians. Athanasius was concerned in no persecutions, except those in which he himself suffered. It was a maxim of Athanasius, that ‘the duty of orthodoxy is not to compel, but to persuade belief.’ Cyril carried his measures by placing himself at the head of bands of ferocious ruffians, and by canonising the assassin. No graver reproach rests on the memory of Athanasius than that of being a powerful magician. Cyril's death suggested to one who has left his feelings on record, that, ‘at last the reproach of Israel was taken away; that he was gone to vex the inhabitants of the world below with his endless dogmatism: let every

one throw a stone upon his grave, lest perchance he should make even hell too hot to hold him, and return to earth.' But the excellence of Athanasius, like that of every theologian, must be measured not by his attacks upon error, but by his defence of truth."—Lect. p. 248.

Let our readers mark attentively all the statements involved in this paragraph—the implied sneer at S. Anselm, and the noble, simple-minded Christian prelate Bishop Ken, who is designated as "good" elsewhere (p. 52)—the light mention of S. Thomas of Canterbury—the very qualified, almost condemnatory praise awarded to S. Athanasius—and the shameless, cruel way in which the memory of S. Cyril is reviled. Dr. Stanley says, "Cyril was suspected even by the orthodox of complicity in the murder of Hypatia." Canon Robertson says (Vol. I., 401), "That Cyril had *any share* in this atrocity appears to be an unsupported calumny." Du Pin, the calm and the candid Ecclesiastical Biographer, allows, that Damascius accused S. Cyril with being the author of Hypatia's death, yet he adds, "But we must not believe that historian. S. Cyril was no way concerned in her death" (Vol. IV. p. 27). The most that Socrates says (vii. 15) is, that this murder brought no small disgrace upon Cyril and the Church of Alexandria. If S. Cyril did receive bribes on any occasion, how comes it to pass that Socrates is so silent upon the subject? Nestorius, the "Incendiary," did not meet with very gentle treatment at S. Cyril's hands; but it was only his own violence being opposed to the stronger arm of the Patriarch of Alexandria. The letter of Theodoret, from which a quotation is made by Dr. Stanley, we will assume to be genuine; the more so from such expressions being applied by him to S. Cyril. The Bishop of Cyrus confuted S. Cyril's "Anathemas" and accused them of heresy. He defended the Eastern Bishops at the Council of Ephesus; he composed five books against S. Cyril; he was angry when Nestorius lost his ground. Even after S. Cyril's death, Dioscorus, his successor, anathematised both Theodoret and his Church. If, instead of following Dean Milman, Dr. Stanley had consulted the pages of an earlier authority with a little deference, he would have given from the picture of Evagrius a different account altogether of S. Cyril, whom the historian mentions as the "Divine Cyril." (Lib. i. c. 4.)

Looking at the Lectures as a whole, their arbitrary and fragmentary nature is apparent. We do not altogether find fault with this mode of treatment. It is better to work one event or one period well and thoroughly than a large number imperfectly. We do not therefore complain that out of the two hundred and fifty-five pages which are devoted to the Eastern Church proper, just one-half is given to the Council of Nice, the remainder being divided between the lives of Constantine and S. Athanasius. The concluding Lectures on the Russian do not make any pretension to great depth or accuracy of research; but they are very interesting

as exploring a tract of ground which is comparatively new to English readers. The first Lecture describes the National Churches of the East—the Chaldean, or Nestorian; the Armenian, the Syrian, the Coptic, the Georgian, the Greek Church, and the Churches of the Northern tribes, of Bulgaria, of Servia, and of the Danubian provinces—then the general characteristics of the Eastern Church are glanced at, the whole concluding with an enumeration of the advantages of that particular study. Dr. Stanley's account of the Old Coptic Church is worthy of attention. He says:—

"The Church of Egypt is much more than the relic of an ancient sect. It is the most remarkable monument of Christian antiquity. It is the only living representative of the most venerable nation of all antiquity. Within its narrow limits have now shrunk the learning and the lineage of ancient Egypt. The language of the Coptic services, understood neither by people nor priests, is the language, although debased, of the Pharaohs. The Copts are still, even in their degraded state, the most civilized of the natives: the intelligence of Egypt still lingers in the Coptic scribes, who are on this account used as clerks in the offices of their conquerors, or as registrars of the water-marks of the Nile: they also represent the proud Church of Old Alexandria." (P. 9.) They were represented at the Council of Nice. "From the interior of Egypt came characters of quite another stamp: not Greeks, nor Grecised Egyptians; but genuine Copts, speaking the Greek language not at all or with great difficulty, living half or the whole of their lives in the desert, their very names taken from the heathen gods of the times of the ancient Pharaohs" (P. 101)—"Potammon, Bishop of Heracleopolis, Paphnutius, Bishop of Upper Thebaid—each having their right eye dug out with the sword and the empty socket seared with a red-hot iron. Paphnutius, besides, came limping on one leg, his left having been hamstrung."—P. 101.

Dr. Stanley's third Lecture on the meeting of the Nicene Council forms the most genial chapter in his book—his personal account of his descent into Nice "in the moonlight of an early morning, from the high wooded steeps of one of the mountain ranges of Bithynia."

"Beneath us lay the long inland lake—the Ascanian lake—which, communicating at its western extremity by a small inlet with the sea of Marmora, fills up almost the whole valley,—itself a characteristic conformation of this part of Asia Minor. Such another is the Lake of Apollonius, seen from the summit of the Mysian Olympus. Such another is the smaller lake, seen in traversing the plain on the way from Broussa." We are next bidden "to transport ourselves back to the same season of the year,—the chestnut-woods then, as now, green with the first burst of summer; the same sloping hills, the same tranquil lake, the same snow-capped Olympus from far, brooding over the whole scene, but, in every other respect, how entirely different."—P. 83.

The various deputies coming to attend the Council are pictori-

ally and carefully treated by Dr. Stanley—the representatives of the Egyptian Church coming first—"brandishing their arguments like spears" (p. 97), a somewhat free expression for the words, "κατ' ἀλλήλων ἀντὶ δοράτων ἐκίνοον τὰς γλώσσας" (Theod. i. 6). We gladly bear witness to the pains and care with which Dr. Stanley has painted the portraits of S. Athanasius and of Arius, of S. James of Nisibis, of Spiridion the present patron-saint of Corfu: in short, all the great men have received an appropriate notice from Dr. Stanley's pen—Eustathius of Antioch, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Macarius of Jerusalem, Leontius of Cæsarea, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Hosius of Cordova. Directly we leave the region of description we find ourselves at issue with Dr. Stanley. We pass by such a sentence as "The frenzy of argument was too vehement to be restrained. Heretics and orthodox alike felt themselves compelled to advance" (p. 117) to the following more important statement.

"The battle was fought and won by quotations not from tradition, but from the Old and New Testament. The overruling sentiment was, that even ancient opinions were not to be received without sifting and inquiry. The chief combatant and champion of the faith was not the Bishop of Antioch or of Rome, nor the Pope of Alexandria, but the Deacon Athanasius. The eager discussions of Nicæa present the first grand precedent for the duty of private judgment and the free unrestrained exercise of Biblical and historical criticism."—P. 117.

Previously Dr. Stanley had quoted the XXIst Anglican Article. S. Athanasius, in all his tracts and treatises, argued from Holy Scripture, which he wrested, text by text, from the grasp of Arian hands. In the Nicene Council doubtless Holy Scripture had a similarly high prerogative assigned, but that it was mingled and confirmed by Church tradition the very passages adduced by Dr. Stanley, to support a contrary view, seem to prove most distinctly. These passages are from Sozomen, i, 17, 25. In the former we read: "*Some of the Bishops spoke against the introduction of novelties contrary to the faith which had been delivered to them from the beginning; and those especially who had adhered to simplicity of doctrine, argued that the faith of God ought to be received without curious inquiries; others, however, contended that former opinions ought not to be retained without examination.*" The majority of the Bishops held to the ancient traditional faith of the Church—to the sacred deposit and form of sound words which had been received by the Church from the beginning. The second passage occurs in a festival letter which the Emperor Constantine wrote to the Bishops of the Churches, to heal, if possible, their dissensions. "And addressing himself more particularly to the Alexandrians, he urged them to receive unanimously the exposition of faith which had been set forth by the Council and had been proved to be ac-

ording to the Divine will, by the fact that so many Bishops, appointed by the HOLY SPIRIT, had, after lengthened disputation and investigation, consented to it."

We cannot see the slightest shadow of support for Dr. Stanley's statement in the note, p. 117,—“the whole tenor of the narrative in Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, points to the conclusion that the existing tradition was alleged not as authority, but as historical evidence, and that it was alleged subordinately to the argument from the Bible itself.” Our readers have already judged for themselves of what Sozomen said. Socrates publishes in his history a letter written by Eusebius Pamphilus, the historian and Bishop of Cæsarea, explaining the “homœousion” in his diocese, containing these plain words:—“As we have received *by tradition* from our predecessors the Bishops, at the time when we were instructed in the first principles of the faith and received Baptism—as we have learnt from the Divine Scriptures”—tradition is mentioned first, Holy Scripture is mentioned afterwards. Socrates again represents the Emperor as saying “that the unanimity of so many and such eminent Prelates was procured by the HOLY GHOST,” “in regard that they were illuminated by GOD and the grace of the HOLY GHOST, they could in no wise err from the truth.” (Soc. lib. i. c. 9.) But the most astounding assertion is, that the Nicene Council affords “the first grand precedent for the duty of *PRIVATE judgment*.” That the free discussion of lawfully called Bishops, met together in Synod, should be called an act of *private* judgment, is a perversion of the common meaning of this term. The Fathers of Nice, or of any other general council, are not private men, but public men—the collective judgment, which they give is not the opinion of one, but of the majority. It is the voice of the Church speaking under particular conditions, and with no ordinary weight and authority—speaking to embody and to define doctrine—speaking to restrain that liberty of private judgment which has ever been to the Church a cause of heresy, schism, strife, bloodshed, and infidelity—speaking to establish a common traditional faith—to unite all Church traditions into one consistent and universally received whole. This calling the opinion of Bishops in Synod an exercise of private judgment, is only another illustration of the well-known fact, that common facts become extraordinary phenomena when viewed through coloured media.

Dr. Stanley has discussed with considerable perspicuity the events which took place at the Council of Nice, particularly the various creeds then put forth—the final Nicene Creed—its confirmation by the Council of Constantinople, to whom rightly he does not attribute the interpolations—the Ephesian decree, touching the integrity of the Nicene Creed—the adoption by the Council of Chalcedon of the additions to the Creed which were current before the Second General Council. At the end of the discussion

Dr. Stanley seems, perhaps unintentionally, to confound articles of faith with articles of religion, which are proposed as terms for religious communion. He mentions in one sentence (pp. 151, 152) the Athanasian and Tridentine Creeds, the Lutheran, Reformed, and Anglican *Articles*, as if they were synonymous and convertible terms. We recite the Nicene Creed with the Constantinopolitan additions. This affords Dr. Stanley a vantage ground from which he can attack *all* creeds and formularies of faith. In short, we appeal to the candour of our readers to judge in all fairness, whether the closing passage of this Fourth Lecture does not justify—and more than justify—all that we have been compelled, as Churchmen, to say in opposition to Dr. Stanley's teaching. Nay, rather ought we not to have written more strongly, and uttered a more unequivocal condemnation? Remembering that the Creeds are the bulwarks of the Church's faith, we read as follows:—

"We might if we chose vex ourselves by the thought, that every time we recite the Creed in its present altered form, we have departed from the intention of the Fathers of Nicæa, and incurred deprivation and excommunication at the hands of the Fathers of Ephesus. We might insist on returning to the only Catholic form of the Creed, such as it was before it was corrupted at Constantinople, Chalcedon, Toledo, and London. But there is a more religious, as well as a more rational inference to be drawn from this long series of unauthorized innovations. Every time that the Creed is recited with its additions and omissions, it conveys to us the wholesome warning that our faith is not of necessity bound up with the literal text of Creeds, or with the formal decrees of Councils. It existed before the Creed was drawn up; it is larger than the letter of any Creed could circumscribe. The fact that the whole Christian world has altered the Creed of Nicæa, and broken the decree of Ephesus, without ceasing to be Catholic or Christian, is a decisive proof that common sense, after all, is the supreme arbiter and corrective, even of Ecumenical Councils."—P. 152.

In support of the proposition that faith "is larger than any creed could circumscribe," Dr. Stanley cites Archbishop Thomson's "Lincoln's Inn Sermons," XII., and Dr. Temple's Essay on "The Education of the World." Let that one expression sink deep into the hearts of our readers. Let them picture to themselves the laxity of belief into which a man must have fallen, who says, and publishes, and holds by the saying, that "*common sense*, after all, is the supreme arbiter and corrective even of Ecumenical Councils." It is very lamentable to find an Oxford Professor expressing himself in such a strain as this—one too so highly gifted, so painstaking, so very industrious. Canon Stanley is fulfilling an important mission, which the Great Head of the Church has entrusted for a time to his keeping. His influence will make itself felt upon some hundreds of those who are destined hereafter

to serve at our altars. How cautious, how diffident of himself does it behove him to be, lest through his teaching any weak brother perish for whom CHRIST died. These subjects are more than mere matters of literary criticism: they are fraught with an eternal consequence—they are bound up with our holiest hopes—with all that is given from on high to guide us through this world of sin and sorrow, and to make us meet to be partakers with the inheritors of the saints in light.

We cannot follow Dr. Stanley through his lectures upon the Russian Church. His notions of reform would not be our notions of reform. We should be compelled to join issue with him upon very many points of opinion and of fact. His Eighth Lecture, upon the relations in which Mahometanism stands to the Eastern, is hardly so well executed as the rest. It is more fanciful and not so highly elaborated as some others of the same course. The likeness of Mahometanism to "Protestantism" and to "Catholicism" contains some resemblances that to us appear forced and strained. One statement in this lecture has caused us to pause a little. It is not so incorrect as an exaggerated statement of the case. Few, if any, pictorial writers are more free from actual slips of the pen than Dr. Stanley. Writing of Mahomet, we read:—

"Some few of his doctrines and legends are remarkable not only as having been derived by him from Christian sources, but as having been received back from him into Christendom. One is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. The assertion of her entire exemption from all stain of sin, first appears, so far as is known, in a chapter in the Koran."—P. 264.

We turn out Dr. Stanley's reference in Mr. Rodwell's translation of the Koran, which is both the most literal and the most accurate representation of the original which has yet appeared, (see *Ecclesiastic*, vol. xxiv. pp. 55—73,) and we read, "So with goodly acceptance did he accept her, and with goodly growth did he make her grow." (Surah III. 32.) Mr. Rodwell has a note upon this portion of the verse:—"According to a tradition of Muhammed, every new-born child is touched by Satan, with the exception of Mary and her SON, between Whom and Satan, GOD interposed a veil. Hence this passage *may* imply the Immaculate Conception of the B. V. Mary. See v. 37 below." V. 37:—"And remember when the angels said, 'O, Mary! verily hath GOD chosen thee, and purified thee, and chosen thee above the women of the worlds.'" This purification does not refer to her purification after child-bearing, but her purifying previous to her conception of the Incarnate Word, her GOD and LORD. Hence it implies that she was born in sin. The former passage *may*, but very indirectly, imply her immaculate conception; yet Dr.

Stanley speaks of it as a doctrine laid down in the Koran with all authority and certainty.

We have had no wish to be critical over much, or there are many points in these Lectures upon which a question might be raised. We would limit the term Eastern Church to the Church of the East, only after, not before, the separation between the East and West; for before that period the Church was united,—was Catholic. Some matters are introduced, which, in our opinion, might have been spared; and others have been omitted, which might with greater propriety have been introduced. On the whole, we will say that to the well-grounded student in ecclesiastical history, these Lectures will afford a few pleasant and refreshing readings; their very one-sidedness and partiality awakening a wholesome reaction against Dr. Stanley's teaching on all questions connected with the authority of the Church. To such a reader the analogy will come home with all due force, that, according to Dr. Stanley's own showing (p. 79,) such an historian as Eusebius of Cæsarea was to the holy Œcumenical Council of Nice, and Paul Sarpi was to the Council of Trent; just such a representative of a portion of the Eastern branch of the Catholic Church, is the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, as he comes before us as the author of "*Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church.*"

MORISON'S LIFE AND TIMES OF S. BERNARD.

The Life and Times of S. Bernard. By J. C. MORISON, M.A.,
Lincoln College. Oxford: Chapman and Hall.

"CÆSAR loves the Muses;" so in the reign of our second George the poets poetically expressed themselves in their dedications to that monarch. The humorous Historian, in this one case not more keenly matter-of-fact than truthful, remarks on this eulogy, that Cæsar loved nothing in the wide world but "punch, and fat women." The immense contrast between the dedicatee in this instance and the poems dedicated, is brought to our mind by the inscription on the present work. We should have as readily associated statesmanship and Mr. Lincoln, patriotism and Mr. Bright, reverence and Mr. Spurgeon, humility and Lord Shaftesbury, as the embodied piety of the eleventh, or indeed any other century, and Mr. Thomas Carlyle. We doubted it at first; but now our eyes, we find, do not deceive us, and this work is inscribed to the great speculative prose-poet of our day. Our first thought was, and in truth our last thought, that probably Mr. Carlyle has been in-

duced to "tak' a thought an' men' ;" that he has become weary of that *pot-theism*,¹ (we suppose he means all theism gone to pot,) which he once jocosely professed ; that having consigned to limbo every living sham—but himself ; and having done this, not, as other and truer men would have done, with vigorous mouth-filling anathemas, but with words so gnarled and grotesque, with phrases so distorted and spasmodic, as entirely to mar and profane the sober sanctity of English speech, he has been filled with his own ways—has become weary of all this dismal, murky cant, and is resolved to study that he may imitate the life of one of God's loftiest saints, and read deeply the writings of one who thought, not as an inmate of Trophonius' Cave, who wrote not as the weak victim of his vocabulary, as the perpetrator of a style, but as became a most masculine full-lived man, who—be the words reverently used—spake what he did know, and testified that which he had seen. If we are not justified in concluding something of the sort from the inscription to this volume, then is the irony of Mr. Morison something more than sublime.

Of the labours of Mr. Morison we desire to speak in terms of sincere commendation. His style has a little, but it is only a very little, of the "*Carlylesque*" manifested in it. He writes with considerable dignity, and, save when reviewing the life and sufferings of Abelard, with all the calm dispassionateness which we are familiar with in Mahon. Indeed but for the exigencies of his monograph we suspect that Mr. Morison would have gladly pursued to a greater length the romantic history of the illustrious Aristotelian. From this part of the volume we shall quote farther on. Mr. Morison's work is divided into four books. The first book carries us through nine chapters, from the Burgundian birthplace of S. Bernard to his thirty-ninth year, when we find him addressing, in very meagre rhetoric, the recently incorporated Knights Templars ; to the creation of which body Mr. Morison is of opinion, that S. Bernard only contributed "a general furtherance and approbation" (p. 159.) These thirty-nine years, which moulded by the deeds and sufferings they brought with them the whole character of S. Bernard, were in their outward aspect comparatively the most uneventful part of his life. His second book, of four chapters, describes the history of S. Bernard during those nine years when his influence began to be felt in the Councils of the Church. The third book, of six chapters, barely covers four years of the saint's life, from his forty-eighth to his fifty-second year ; but is peculiarly interesting from the sketch it furnishes of Abelard, and what we may call mediæval ideology. The fourth book, in five chapters, brings us to the closing scenes of that life, in which "no part so well became him," as the "manner of his leaving it."

¹ Those who have read the painful sketch of Stirling's life will recognise the allusion.

S. Bernard was born in Burgundy, in 1091. Not far from Dijon, within view of the Côte d'Or hills, may still be seen an old archway, all that remains of the castle or fortress of Tesselin—the father of one daughter and six sons. Of these sons, five of whom ultimately devoted themselves to the monastic life, S. Bernard was the third. The father was a man of knightly rank, and of considerable distinction as a soldier, and the personal friend of the Duke of Burgundy. Of honourable birth, he was not of that high extraction which marked S. Francis Xavier, whose life was recently noticed in this Review.¹ But Tesselin was a fearless and reproachless chevalier, to whose inherent dignity genealogical honours could not contribute anything.

“He was a most brave knight; but he never took up arms but for the defence of his own land, or in company with his lord of Burgundy. On one occasion he was drawn into a quarrel, and a single combat was arranged between him and his adversary. The day and place of meeting were fixed, the enemies appeared. Tesselin was by far the stronger man, and his victory would have brought him no small advantage. But the feeling that all this was radically wrong, overpowered every other. Divine exhortations to charity and peace, divine condemnations of violence and strife, crowded on his mind. He determined to be ‘reconciled to his adversary.’ He offered terms which he knew would be accepted. He relinquished the point in dispute. In that stern time, when force was generally law, a man must have been very sure both of his courage and piety to act thus. Gentle yet brave, modest yet strong and rich, such a man was S. Bernard’s father.”—Pp. 2, 3.

But here, as in so many other cases, the distinctive character of the child seems to be more especially derived from the mother. The “earnest-loving and devout Alith,” deserves to take rank with Monica and Arethusa. “Quiet as a nun, breathless with adoration,” seems the whole tenor of a life spent amid works of charity, and such religious rigour as would have reflected credit on any conventual establishment which might have had the honour of enrolling her among its sisters.

“By scantiness of food, by simplicity of dress, by the avoidance of worldly pleasures, by fasting, prayer, and vigils, she strove after that ideal of self-sacrifice and holiness, which was alone attractive and beautiful in that age.”—P. 4.

Under the care of parents so well fitted to the charge were the foundations of the mind of Bernard laid. “He was passing from

¹ The writer of that review has failed to note an error of Mr. Venn’s, p. 79. Mr. Venn says, “We must not forget that he belonged to a Church which canonised Charlemagne.” The Church did nothing of the kind. It *beatified* him. The difference may be nothing to Mr. Venn; but it tells considerably on Mr. Venn’s argument, however it may affect Charlemagne. See the *Ecclésiastic* for February, 1863.

boyhood to youth when his mother died." We cannot forbear quoting the following admirable passages, and so completing the brief sketch of the sainted Alith :

"It was her custom on the festival of S. Ambrose (the patron saint of the church at Fontaines), to assemble a number of clergy in her house, and 'to the glory of God, the Blessed Virgin, and the above-mentioned saint,' solemnly to refresh them with food and wine on that day. A few days before the anniversary, which was to be the last, it was revealed to her that she would die on the festival. On the vigil of the feast she was taken ill with fever. The next day she sent for her eldest son, Guido, and requested him, as soon as the feast was over, to bring the guests to her bedside. They assembled around her, and she told them that her death was near. They immediately began to chant a litany, supplicating God for her soul. She joined in with them, and sang devoutly till her very last breath. When the chorus of voices toned forth the words 'Deliver her, O LORD, by Thy Cross and Passion,' in the act of making the sign of the Cross, her life and psalm of praise ceased together; and after her breath had fled her hand remained erect and fixed, as she had elevated it to perform her last act of faith.

"We are told how she was wont to appear to her sons after death, how she exhorted Bernard to persevere in the good work he had begun, when he became a monk. These fond credulities of an unscientific age are little tolerated in our time. Yet we may accept the legend as conveying or veiling a known fact of human nature, and acknowledge that the tomb gives a robe of beauty unseen in the sunlight, and that the words of the departed acquire a strange reverberating echo from the vaults wherein they sleep."—Pp. 8, 9.

We must close our extract with thanks to Mr. Morison for his reverential rendering of this touching incident or fancy. We shall have now and then to complain of a careless treatment of Christian verities in his volume. We the more cheerfully render our homage where we may.

After his mother's death the young Burgundian was free to choose his way of life. As with our own great statesman, Bernard, now nineteen years of age, found three courses open to him: he might either adopt the profession of arms, and join the stormy camp, at a time when every one was either besieging or being besieged, killing or being killed: or he might enrol himself among the disciples of reviving literature, whose evangelist was no less a person than Master Peter Abelard, of Nantes, in Brittany, destined to be the propagator of a new, as Bernard himself was destined to close an old ecclesiastical order: or lastly, there was the calm and repose of monastic life, broken only, but alas! always broken by the unquietable will and spirit of the flesh. The battle field and the school had well nigh equal charms for Bernard; but as the attractions of the former were prevailing, he set out to

"join his brothers, who with the Duke of Burgundy were at their usual occupation of besieging a castle. He doubtless felt he had fallen from the high resolves and aspirations of his early youth. The life of holiness and prayer which had seemed to open before him under his mother's example and conversation, had faded away now. Self-reproach and shame at this spiritual retrogression filled his mind with heaviness and grief. In this mood he rode along over the bare moor or through the tangled forest, thoughtful and sad. Presently he came to a church. But by this time the dark cloud of doubt and wavering had broken and vanished before the rising sun of faith. On his knees, in that wayside church, and in a torrent of tears, 'he lifted his hands to heaven, and poured forth his heart like water in the presence of his LORD.' From that hour his purpose of entering the monastic life never faltered."¹—P. 14.

Overpowered by his importunity, Guido and Gerard, his elder brothers, and Bartholomew and Andrew, his younger brothers, followed his example. Guido indeed was a married man. But Bernard induced his sister-in-law herself to become a religious. He had less difficulty to overcome, and he was therefore the more immediately successful with his wealthy and powerful uncle, the Lord of the castle of Touillon. They all followed him to Cîteaux, then enjoying the presidency of a sturdy Englishman, Stephen Harding, and just having completed its fifteenth year of existence under the strictest observance of the Benedictine rule. Here Bernard passed through the usual normal stages of asceticism. Nothing in that most severe Benedictine system of rigour was rigorous enough for him; and he permanently weakened a naturally strong constitution by his outrageous efforts to withstand the innocent requirements of nature. Assuredly "the kingdom of God is neither meat nor drink," whether as rejected or received. But one healthy impulse, which severer asceticists would have endeavoured to extirpate as among the worst of all, Bernard was fortunately led to foster; and this in turn delivered him from the scarcely disguised Manicheism into which his conventual observances were betraying him. His love of nature was deep, earnest, and devout. It possessed all that vigour and purity which so much delights us in Wordsworth. To Bernard the outward shapes of the visible creation were the forms designed and moulded under the broodings of the HOLY GHOST; and echoes of the creative Word babbled along the brook or rustled in the leaves. "*Quidquid in Scripturis valet, quidquid in eis spiritualiter sentit maxime in silvis et in agris meditando et orando se confitetur accepisse, et in hoc nullus aliquando se magistros habuisse, nisi quercus et fagos—joco illo suo gratioso inter amicos dicere solet.*"² Another influ-

¹ Mr. Morison quotes faithfully and renders carefully. He here quotes from the narrative.—S. Bern. Op. vol. ii. col. 1066.

² Op. vol. ii. col. 1072.

ence which was destined to rescue Bernard from his monastic austerities, and prolong his valuable life, was the frequent interruption caused by the requirements made on him alike by Church and State.

As might be expected from such a character, he resolved to establish a new conventual establishment. Citeaux had grown so rapidly in numbers since Bernard with his thirty converts entered it, it was found necessary to enlarge its border. Accordingly twelve monks, headed by Bernard, carrying the Cross laid on his shoulder by Stephen, went forth in imitation of the LORD, and not knowing whither they went. After journeying northward some hundred miles, they reached the valley of Wormwood, in the diocese of Langres, in June 1115. Here in the midst of the greatest privations they erected the abbey of Clairvaux, that sacred retreat from whence he was so often to hurry forth to calm the troubled waters of public life and to guide the helm of the State; where he was to witness the blissful departure and close the eyes of the blessed Malachi; where he was himself four years after the Irish primate's decease to receive the Divine gift of holy dissolution. He says of the decease of Saint Malachi:

"With psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, we followed our friend on his homeward journey. In the fifty-fourth year of his age, in the place, and at the time he had foretold and chosen, Bishop Malachi, taken by angels out of our hands, happily fell asleep in the LORD. Truly he fell asleep. All eyes were fixed upon him, yet none could say when the spirit left him. When he was dead he was thought to be alive; while yet alive he was supposed to be dead. The same brightness and serenity were ever visible. Death seemed to have no power over them; nay, it seemed to increase them. He was not changed, but we.¹ Marvellously and suddenly the sobs and grief were hushed. Sorrow was changed into joy, song banished lamentation. Faith had triumphed. And indeed wherefore should we bewail Malachi above measure,—as if his death were not precious,—as if it were not sleep rather than death,—as if the port of death were not the portal of life? Malachi our friend sleepeth, and shall I weep? If the LORD has given sleep to His beloved one, and such a sleep in which was the inheritance of God, the reward of the Son, the fruit of the womb, which of these tells me to weep? Shall I bewail him who has escaped from tears? He rejoices, he triumphs, he enters into the joy of his LORD; and shall I make lamentation over him? All things being prepared in the church of the Holy Mary, Mother of God, in the which he had been well pleased, Malachi was com-

¹ Compare the same thought in Wordsworth's lines, "On a Picture, by F. Stone." "They are the substance, they, and we the shadows." Mr. Morison on the preceding sentence, "Mortuus vivere, et vivens mortuus putabatur," quotes Hood's beautiful lines,

"We thought her dying when she slept,
And sleeping when she died."—P. 472.

mitted to the tomb in the year of the Incarnation 1148. Thine, O JESUS, is the treasure which is entrusted to us. We keep it to be restored to Thee, when Thou shalt think fit to ask it. We pray only that he may not go forth from hence, without his companions, but that he who was our guest, may be also our leader, to reign with Thee and him for ever and ever. Amen."—P. 478.

This passage marks one of the great features of S. Bernard's character,—a surpassing tenderness. This is exhibited at great length in the very touching sermon which S. Bernard preached on the death of his brother Gerard (p. 26), from which our space will not allow us to quote here in this connection. Further on, with another purpose in view, we shall make an extract from it. Mr. Morison has done good service in furnishing this homily to his readers. He characterises it very truly as "assuredly among funeral sermons one of the most remarkable on record. Evidently the monk in those days did not cease to be a man, even a loving and impassioned man." Indeed, speaking generally, one of the most attractive of the many attractive features in the life of S. Bernard, was the number of his friends. Few, if any, among illustrious men have drunk so deeply of the love of friends. When consecrated Abbot of Clairvaux, in his twenty-fourth year, he succeeded in conciliating the lifelong affection of the "most renowned Master William of Champeaux," Bishop of Chalons, and "the experienced Master of the Paris Schools." We have already adverted to his friendship with the Irish Primate. There was also William of Thierry, his would-be biographer. There might be added a long list of Prelates, Abbots, Popes, and Kings.

Twelve years were passed by the Abbot of Clairvaux in the almost unbroken repose of his retreat. We say almost unbroken. Indeed Mr. Morison's sketch leaves us to suppose that, save for the illness with which he was visited, his calm life knew no interruption except that arising from the responsibility of his office. The abduction of his kinsman Robert was the most painful event which during this time befel him. A reluctant monk, dedicated to this way of life from his cradle, he knew well the difference between the austere Clairvaux and the indulgent Cluny. And an opportunity presenting itself he made his escape. The incident was a most trying one for the forsaken abbot. It was nothing short of a defeat. Bad as was the desertion, it was still worse that the deserter was the near kinsman¹ of the abbot, and one of that sacred company of thirty, who together with S. Bernard entered upon the religious life. Such an incident seemed to proclaim to the world the spiritual incompetency and the actual unworthiness of the Abbot of Clairvaux. Bernard wrote to the young deserter a long and curious epistle, in which,

¹ He was the son of the sister of Alith, S. Bernard's mother.

as Mr. Morison describes it, "genuine feeling and rhetorical bombast alternately contend for and obtain the mastery. His wrath against Cluny, and his tenderness for Robert, struggle for utterance in succeeding sentences, through four folio pages." Mr. Morison seems to us to omit the most interesting and characteristic part of this very remarkable letter,—the opening sentences. These we shall transcribe in the original, partly because in fact Bernard's Latin is very sweet,¹ partly because Mr. Morison is on the subject of translations rather hard to please.² The letter in Mabillon's edition and Migne's reprint ranks the first in the great saint's correspondence.

"Satis, et plusquam satis, sustinui, dilectissime fili Roberte, si forte Dei pietas, et tuam per se, et meam per te animam dignaretur invisere: tibi scilicet inspirando salutarem compunctionem, mihi que de tua salute lætitiā. Sed quoniam usque adhuc frustratum me cerno ab expectatione mea, jam non valeo tegere dolorem meum, anxietatem reprimere, dissimulare tristitiā. Unde et contra juris ordinem cogor revocare, læsus, eum qui me læsit; spretus requirere contemptorem; injuriam passus injuriatori satisfacere; rogare denique, a quo rogari debueram. Dolor quippe nimius non deliberat, non verecundatur, non consulit rationem, non metuit dignitatis damnum, legi non obtemperat, judicio non acquiescit, modum ignorat et ordinem: id omnimodo et solummodo satagente animo, quo vel careat quod se dolet habere, vel habeat quo se dolet carere."

A passage very touching and beautiful, and surely free from any alloy of bombast. The almost passionate remonstrances of S. Bernard were at first unsuccessful in recalling Robert to his duty; but after some time, on the death of the too attractive and indulgent Pontius, he was restored to S. Bernard by the successor of Pontius, Peter the venerable, and was subsequently by his forgiving relative made an abbot.³

¹ Dean Trench, who highly extols the beauty of Bernard's style, qualifies his eulogy by the remark, in reference to S. Bernard's designation as "*Doctor Mellifluus*," that "the honey perhaps was sometimes a little too honied."—Trench's *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 119, note.

² Mr. Morison, while approving Mr. Flower's English version of S. Bernard's Sermons, is severely critical in detail, indeed so as to force into question his own scholarship. The first (372 n.) and third (377 n.) of the censured renderings are evidently the results of oversight in correcting the press. The second Mr. Morison notes thus, having in his text "O lowest and highest." "Latin: 'O novissimum et altissimum'; translated by Mr. Flower 'O latest born and oldest.' Did Mr. Flower confuse the German 'Alt' with the Latin 'Altus'?" If Mr. Flower had confused the two words, he would not have wandered from the real sense of *Altus*, which has been constantly employed in classical Latin, as any dictionary will show, to express antiquity. [Mr. Flower's "Sermons for the Seasons of the Church, translated from S. Bernard" (Masters), were noticed in this review, Vol. xxiii. p. 330.]

³ *Dormus Dei in Dicececi Bisuntinensi Abbatem a Bernardo postea institutum. Vide Manriquez in Annalibus anno 1113 et anno 1117. S. Bernard Opp. col. 1, note. The letter to his first cousin Robert is placed first in the collection of 495 letters, because written under supposed miraculous circumstances. "Sub dio dictata in medio imbre, sine imbre."*

We have dwelt the longer on this incident, because it places in a very clear light the strong affectionateness of the great Abbot. The discipline of the monastic life was never directed by him to smother or extirpate the good natural emotions. He had too intuitive a knowledge of the Divine Word, to read according to the letter the command to hate father and mother. He never could have formed so mistaken a sense of duty, as to pass by without visiting, as Xavier did, a dying parent. The strong tenderness of heart which helped him to find the highest religious impulses in the green wood and the pleasant fields, asserted its sovereignty over him all the days of his life. In fact he had nothing of the hermit, and but little of the monk in his moral constitution. He never seems so much himself as when he is giving full rein to his human sensibilities, and indulging sympathies which the monk of a later age would denounce as unlawful. To this extent we take exception to Mr. Morison's statement, that the "excessive puritanism of the Cistercians" "made them such valuable monitors and reformers throughout the byways of Europe." It is quite true that they like all the regulars, looked upon the secular clergy as "contented with a low standard of morals and religion;" but S. Bernard, and, so far as he may be regarded as a representative man, his monks cherished an amount of natural feeling, which seems strangely out of keeping with sterner and later rules with which we are not unacquainted.

It was inevitable that such a man should acquire great influence among his contemporaries; and this influence is, in a very great measure due to his power of letter-writing, at once vigorous and persevering. Some of his letters are indeed equivalent to sermons. Mr. Morison judiciously calls attention to the evident improvement which can be traced in the later parts of his correspondence. "The exuberance of mediæval grandiloquence" is here sensibly curtailed, nor are they deficient in traces of humour. The admirable letter to Ogerius, who had troubled Bernard with something approaching to flattery, furnishes an instance of this. The conclusion of the letter is indeed amusing:

"What you asked of me touching Norbert, viz. whether he be going to Jerusalem, I cannot tell you. I saw him and spoke to him a few days ago, and from that heavenly flute—I mean his mouth—I heard many things; but on this point nothing at all. But when I spoke of Antichrist, and asked his opinion, he declared that he knew most certainly that he—Antichrist—would be manifested during this very generation which now is. When I pressed him to give me the reasons for his certitude, his answer was not of a kind to make me adopt his view as undoubted truth."—P. 89.

From the sermons of S. Bernard, Mr. Morison gives a very well-chosen selection of extracts. His first essay as a preacher was

made in Sermons on the Annunciation, four of which he produced in his twenty-ninth year. They are well characterised as essentially *hard* Homilies; and "it is strange, almost wonderful," that the same lips should have "afterwards poured forth the soft poetry of the Sermons on the Canticles." S. Bernard would not have his charge forget, in their highest estimate of bodily virginity, that half of the virgins were foolish.

"Virginity is a laudable virtue, but more necessary is humility. One is of admonition, the other is of command. To one you are invited, to the other you are compelled. Of one it is said, 'He that is able to receive it, let him receive it'; of the other it is said, 'Unless ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.' One is rewarded, the other is exacted. You may, in a word, be saved without virginity, you cannot be saved without humility. Humility may be pleasing, even though it has lost its virginity; but without humility, I make bold to say, that even Mary's virginity would not have been acceptable. 'Upon whom shall My Spirit rest, except upon the humble and meek?' Upon the humble, he says, not upon a virgin. If Mary, therefore, had not been humble, the HOLY SPIRIT would not have rested upon her; and if He had not rested upon her, He could not have impregnated her. For how could she have conceived of Him without Him? It is clear, then, that in order for her to conceive of the HOLY SPIRIT, as she herself says, He regarded the lowliness of His handmaiden, rather than her virginity; and if she pleased through virginity, she conceived through humility."—P. 59.

Entirely apart from the homiletical merits of this passage, we cannot be insensible to the stream of sound sense which pervades it. The following, from the fifth Sermon on the Canticles, will remind the reader of some fine sentences in the first book of the Ecclesiastical Polity:

"On the other hand, whether the angelic bodies be natural to the spirits themselves as men's bodies are to them—whether the animal bodies be, like men, immortal, although they are not men—whether they can change and alter their bodies in form and appearance when they wish to appear, diversifying and solidifying them as they choose, naturally being of such subtle and impalpable substance as to be imperceptible to our senses, or whether abiding in their simple spiritual state they put on bodily forms when they want them, casting them aside again when they have served their purpose, suffering them to dissolve into the material from which they the bodily forms were taken, these are points on which I would rather not speak. The Fathers appear to have held diverse opinions respecting them. I do not see clearly which I ought to teach, and confess I do not know. I, moreover, do not think that a knowledge of these subtleties will assist you much in your progress. But bear this in mind, that no spirit can by itself reach unto our minds, that is, supposing

it to have no assistance from our bodies or its own. No spirit can so mix with, and be poured into us, that we become in consequence either learned or good. No angel, no soul can comprehend me; none can I comprehend in this manner. Even angels themselves do not thus seize each other's thoughts, i.e., without bodily organs. This prerogative is reserved for the highest and unbounded SPIRIT, Who alone when He imparts knowledge either to angels or man, does not need that we should have ears to hear, or that He should have a mouth to speak. By Himself He is poured in; by Himself He is made manifest. Pure Himself, He is understood by the pure. He alone needs nothing; alone sufficient to Himself, and to all by His sole omnipotent will. Yet He works things immense and numerous by means of the subject creature, be it corporeal or spiritual; but as commanding, not as intreating."—Pp. 202, 3.

Upon these Sermons on the Canticles, more than any other of his compositions, rests the popularity of S. Bernard as a great teacher. We the more regret that the title and design of his volume of translations, precluded Mr. Flower from drawing upon these treasures. It was in a measure natural for the great Cistercian to approach the subject of spiritual emotiveness, with a passionate human-divine fervency. We, with all our insular and climatic characteristics, are never likely to attain to a like degree of sacred warmth. If we are to enter generally into this Holiest within the Holiest, and understand the mysteries of Divine Affection, we shall need more study of the Song of Songs than is usually accorded to it. It rarely furnishes even a text for a sermon. There is, perhaps, one Bishop in the British Empire qualified to give us in English dress S. Bernard's Sermons on the Canticles. The whole subject furnishes a divine study, which the Anglo-Catholic will pursue according to his wont; beginning with the Divine Element, and keeping it evermore above and before the human. With him there is but little danger of the Pentecostal *ἀγάπη* degenerating into *ἔρως*. S. Bernard's exercises stopped at the third chapter. Mabillon, in the third volume of Migne's reprint, gives the sermons of S. Bernard's successor, who preached on the third and fourth. The title is suggestive of solemn thoughts. "*Gilberti de Hollandia Abbatis Ordinis Cisterciensis Sermones, in canticum Salomonis ab eo loco ubi beatus Bernardus morte præventus desuit.*"

We shall place before our readers some extracts from these Sermons, adding a passage from Gilbert, and subjoining some extracts from a modern author on the same text. Mr. Morison gives us, as we have already said, the "Funeral Sermon of Bernard on the death of Gerard his Brother." Mr. Morison does not state, as he might have done, that the Sermon is one of the series on the Song of Songs:¹ in fact it is the twenty-sixth.

¹ The grudging Abelardians accused Bernard of want of art, and—what is clearly disproved by Mabillon—want of originality in this discourse.—See Bernard's Op. I. 1353, note.

We may preface the extract by observing, that this dearly beloved Brother Gerard was blessed with a most saintly and peaceful ending. For profound spiritual and withal human feeling, we know few things that will bear comparison with this admirable address. We must, however, content ourselves with extracting the opening part, as furnishing a fair specimen of S. Bernard as an expositor, referring our readers to Morison, or Mabillon, for the personal part of the Sermon :

“As the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon.”—Solomon's Song, i. 5.

“‘You are meeting to hear what these words mean, and how they are connected with the previous clause, since a comparison is made between them. Perhaps both members of the comparison, viz., ‘As the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon,’ refer only to the first words, ‘I am black.’ It may be, however, that the simile is extended to both clauses, and each is compared with each. The former sense is the more simple, the latter the more obscure. Let us try both, beginning with the latter which seems the more difficult. There is no difficulty, however, in the first comparison, ‘I am black as the tents of Kedar,’ but only in the last. For Kedar, which is interpreted to mean ‘darkness’ or ‘gloom,’ may be compared with blackness justly enough; but ‘the curtains of Solomon’ are not so easily likened to beauty. Moreover, who does not see that ‘tents’ fit harmoniously with the comparison? For what is the meaning of ‘tents’ except our bodies in which we sojourn for a time. Nor have we an abiding city, but we seek one to come. In our bodies, as under tents, we carry on warfare. Truly we are violent to take the kingdom. Indeed the life of man here on earth is a warfare; and as long as we do battle in this body we are absent from the LORD, i.e., from the light. For the LORD is light, and so far as anyone is not in Him, so far he is in darkness, i.e., in Kedar. Let each one, then, acknowledge the sorrowful exclamation as his own, ‘Woe is me that my sojourn is prolonged! I have dwelt with them that dwell in Kedar. My soul hath long sojourned in a strange land.’ Therefore this habitation of the body is not the mansion of the citizen, nor the house of the native, but either the soldier's tent, or the traveller's inn. This body, I say, is a tent, and a tent of Kedar, because, by its interference, it prevents the soul from beholding the infinite light, nor does it allow her to see the light at all, except through a glass darkly, and not face to face. Do you not see whence blackness comes to the Church—whence a certain rust cleaves to even the fairest souls? Doubtless it comes from the tents of Kedar, from the practice of laborious warfare, from the long continuance of a painful sojourn, from the straits of our grievous exile, from our feeble cumbersome bodies; for the corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things. Therefore the souls desire to be loosed, that being freed from the body they may fly into the embrace of CHRIST. For a soul of this kind knoweth that, while in the tents of Kedar

she cannot be entirely free from spot or wrinkle, nor from some stains of blackness, and wishes to go forth and put them off. And here we have the reason why the Spouse calls herself black as the tents of Kedar. But now, how is she beautiful as the curtains of Solomon? Behind these curtains I find that an indescribable holiness and sublimity are veiled, which I dare not presume to touch, save at the command of Him who shrouded and sealed the mystery. For I have read, He that is a searcher of Majesty, shall be overwhelmed with the glory.'"¹—Pp. 256—258.

¹ " 'I am black,' singular confession! The Bride of the Most High black! How everything runs counter to our reason and natural conceptions in the kingdom of CHRIST! Reason can only conceive of a child of God as a most pure and immaculate being; and behold here steps forth a child of God—a soul entirely given up to the LORD—and declares, without the smallest reserve, 'I am black, O ye daughters of Jerusalem.' Black both inwardly and outwardly. And whence then thy blackness, thou fairest among women? 'The sun has looked upon me.' The sun, what sun? Surely not the Sun of Righteousness, which brings only healing in his wings, and is the source of all light? Yes, the very source. In his vicinity, in the beaming of his rays, the Shulamite has become black. Our blackness and sinfulness is hid from us, until the Eternal Sun draws us into the circle of His light; until in the radiant presence of the glory of God we become conscious of our darkness, and through His Spirit look down into the rayless abyss of our nature. 'I am black,' says the Bride, 'but comely.' If we gather together all that we have and are in ourselves, and throw it from us as dung and dross, as having the ban and curse cleaving to it, then are we most pleasing in His sight. How comely? Comely and beauteous as the curtains of Solomon. Solomon's curtains may have been costly and magnificent; but there is one curtain which is not surpassed in glory and beauty. It is not made with man's hand, nor can man imitate it. The Eternal King Solomon has woven it with many cries and tears. This curtain is the robe of salvation, it is the righteousness of our Surety. Yes, in the golden vestment of her King, in Solomon's princely apparel, in His own righteousness is she arrayed. But within also, as David says, is the King's daughter glorious, notwithstanding all her blackness. Then she is not only comely as the curtains of Solomon, but also as she herself tells us in the text, 'as the tents of Kedar.' Chiefly is this thought present with her, 'CHRIST in us;' while in the expression, 'the curtains of Solomon,' she had ever CHRIST for us before her mind, 'I am comely as the tents of Kedar.' And the comeliness consists, lastly, in her not following her own will. But as the tents of Kedar are borne by their shepherds, so is she borne by her King Solomon, removed and pitched wherever it may please Him in His love, whether it may please Him to lead her into green pastures, or assign her a place in the desert. So is she also conscious of being a stranger in the world, anticipating with joyful hope the time when her King will dissolve her earthly tabernacle, and assign her a new one full of splendour and glory.'"—From the third of "Fourteen Sermons on the Canticles," by Dr. F. W. Krummacher.

Abbot Gilbert will be found not inferior to his sainted predecessor. Cantic. III. 1. "Vides quanta bona contineantur in lectulo? Quies, libertas, illecebra. In lectulo enim quietis et vacuitatis vota magis inardescunt. Locus accommodatus oblectamento charitatis sponsam ad querendum urget ardentius. Illic enim ægricus caret dilecto ubi poterat uberius frui. In lectulo inquit, meo, et per noctes. Quæ per noctes querit non videtur mihi tam aspectus quam amplexus sectari. Tenere optat magis, quam intueri. Bona quidem visio est, sed adhesio arctior. Nam qui adhæret Domino unus est Spiritus. (1 Cor. vi. 17.) Melior tamen utraque. Nam conjunctæ vicissim incrementis se cumulant gratiarum. Utramque si te apprehensurum non arbitraris, sectare tu quod sponsa sectatur. Amplexus quære dilecti. Ignorantiæ tuæ nox, imo noctes ignorantiarum tuarum serenam tibi visionem admittit secretorum cælestium. Tu suavia sequere. Quære ut persentias illa, si scire non potes. Nox non præscribit deliciis, nam et ipsis aliquoties illustratur. Nos, inquit, illuminatio mea in deliciis meis. (Ps. cxxxviii. 11.) In deliciis ait; non in scientiis. Ita et tu noctem, si non potes scientiis, pertenta illuminare deliciis. Quidquid hic videmus per speculum, et in enigmate, totum in nocte est. Et in hac

Very characteristic of the style of S. Bernard is the following, from the Eleventh Sermon on the Canticles :

"Therefore I exhort you, my friends, to leave for a season the painful and anxious remembrance of your ways, to strike away into the softer paths of memory, and dwell on the loving-kindness of God, that you who are confounded in yourselves may recover by gazing on Him. I wish you to experience that which the holy Prophet advised, saying, 'Delight thou in the LORD, and He shall give thee thy heart's desire.' Now grief over sin is necessary, if it be not constant; it must be broken by the more joyful remembrance of the Divine goodness, lest the heart grow hardened through sadness, and from despair perish more exceedingly. Let us mix honey with our wormwood, in order that the wholesome bitter tempered by the added sweetness, may be swallowed, and give us health. These two things, then, are the manner and the fruit, or result of our redemption. Now the manner is the emptying out or humbling of God; the fruit thereof is our being filled with Him. To dwell on the last is a seed-plot of holy hope; to think of the former an incentive to the highest love. Both are necessary to our progress, that hope without love should not grow sordid, nor love wax cold, hoping for no return. But indeed we expect such a return for our love as He whom we love has promised us, 'Good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom.' That measure I hear will be without measure. But I would fain know of what is that measure to consist, or rather that immensity which is promised in return. Eye hath not seen, O God, beside Thee, the things that Thou hast prepared for them that love Thee. Tell us, then, Thou Who preparest, what Thou preparest. This pleases, this is sweet, this delights us to inquire concerning it, whatever it may be. And they shall all be taught of God; and He will be all in all. As I understand, the fulness which we expect from God will not be ex-

nocte potest Jesus meus magis dulci quodam affectu suaviter sentiri, quam sciri ad purum. Ideo etsi nondum ad contuitum admittitur contactum tamen sectatur, dilectum in lectulo et per noctes querens. Quid si ad inventionem dilecti et nox operatur? Cooperatur plane, et accomodate satis. Sicut in lectulo sanctæ quietis accipis otium, sic oblivionem quamdam intellige in nocte. Utrumque sapientiæ et contemplationis negotio opportunitatem ministrat. Nec Salomon vult te scribere sapientiam nisi in tempore otii. (Eccl. xxxviii. 25.) Nec Paulus in anteriora extenditur, nisi prius eorum quæ retro sunt oblitus. (Philipp. iii. 13.) Bona ergo nox, quæ prudenti oblivione dissimulat omnia temporalia, ad illum qui æternus est querendum, tempus expediens, explicans occasiones: quæ mundi concupiscentiam abscondet, curam, cogitatum. Hoc est enim mundum habere absconditum, vel mundo abscondi. Bona umbra, quæ carnis prudentiam obscurat, concupiscentiam refrigerat."—Bernardi Opp. Tom. III. col. 2, 3.

It is much to be regretted how little this most sublime part of the Holy Scriptures is studied and expounded in the English Church. It cannot be a matter of wonder that portions of the Divine Word are assailed, when portions are entirely overlooked. The spiritual chilliness, which is almost constitutional with us, is the effect (not the cause) of our neglecting this part of God's Word. Great service would be rendered by a cheap reprint—*untranslated*—of Origen's work on the Song of Songs, which is preserved in S. Jerome's works, Opp. Vol. VIII. p. 122. Mr. Thrupp's work has not yet reached us; but we hope on a future occasion to give a lengthened notice of it.

cept of God. But who can grasp the magnitude of delights comprehended in that short word? God will be all in all. Not to speak of the body, I perceive these things in the soul,—reason, will, memory; and these three make up the soul. How much each of these in this present world lacks of completion and perfection, is felt by every one who walketh in the spirit. Wherefore is this, except that because God is not yet all in all? Therefore it is that our reason falters in judgment, that our will is feeble and distracted, that our memory confounds us by its forgetfulness. We are subjected unwillingly to this threefold weakness, but hope abides. For He Who fills with good things the desires of the soul, He Himself will be to the reason the fulness of light; to the will the abundance of peace; to the memory the unbroken smoothness of eternity.¹ O truth! O charity! O blessed and blessing Trinity, to Thee my miserable trinity miserably groans, while it is in exile from Thee!”—Pp. 208—211.

We have hitherto dwelt exclusively on S. Bernard's personal history. In our next number we shall enlarge the scope of our essay, so as briefly to review the “Times” in which he lived.

OFFICES OF THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH.

Offices of the Service Books of the Holy Eastern Church; with Translation, Notes, and Glossary. By R. F. LITLEDAL, M.A., LL.D., Priest of the Church of England. London: Williams and Norgate. 1863.

As a general rule English Churchmen are profoundly ignorant of the ritual of the Oriental Churches; this ignorance arises partly from the difficulty of procuring the office books of those Churches, and partly from ignorance of the language, excepting, of course, the Greek, in which they are written; very few of us know anything of Russian or Armenian—even our knowledge of the Greek offices went little further than the liturgies; the daily and occasional offices remain generally unknown: and yet these latter are singularly full and rich. We need only refer to the labours of Mr. Neale, as the one above all, to whom ritualistic scholars are most indebted.

Devotional books are obtained easily from the Greek booksellers; they are generally printed at Venice; we have one before us now containing, besides forms of prayer, a calendar, tables to find Easter, and a menology. The Decalogue, the Nicene Creed, and that of

¹ We prefer the simplicity of the original, “*ipsa memorie continuatio eternitatis.*”

S. Athanasius, are found in it. The Decalogue contains the two tables as we use them, not as divided by the Roman Church. The Creed of S. Athanasius, called symbolon, and not hymnos as we might have expected, has been altered to fit in with the Greek doctrine of the single procession of the HOLY GHOST, the words 'and the Son' being omitted in the twenty-third verse.

Authorized expositions of the doctrine of the Orthodox Church are more accessible. Mr. W. Palmer led the way a few years ago in publishing a translation of Plato's Catechism; a cheap and very useful edition, with some dissertations, was also published by Mr. Potessaro, a Greek, in Manchester, in 1857. There are, however, older translations than these; we have one before us now from the Slavonic, by Mr. Pinkerton, printed in Edinburgh in 1814, with a valuable appendix, containing "an account of the origin and present condition of the Russian dissenters, derived from the best Russian publications, as well as from personal observation and inquiry; and, with regard to one interesting fact, from a Russian manuscript, with which the author was favoured by a nobleman of distinction in that country."

Dr. King's valuable work "on the Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia," published in 1772, is now rarely to be met with. We may mention that the Office Books of the Russian Church are contained in twenty folio volumes; a formidable array for even the most enthusiastic scholar, and indeed the extreme copiousness of the Oriental offices defeats its own purpose, by rendering it all but impossible to recite them. Mr. Freeman, in his "Principles of Divine Service," Vol. I., gives us some account of them; he says, "such then is the great Morning Office of the East; perhaps the most magnificent and most finely-conceived office of ordinary worship which the Church has ever possessed." (p. 130.) We believe that the practice of the Greek Church is to have only one daily service of common prayer in parish churches, and that at the ninth hour (i.e., three o'clock, p.m.) when—the writer is speaking from his own observation—several offices are said by accumulation; but even then the priest recites so rapidly and indistinctly that it is impossible to follow him; a choir of boys—many of them members of the priest's family—make the responses and sing; the congregation apparently takes no part in the offices; they cannot understand them, since the vernacular Romaic is very different from the Byzantine Greek, in which the offices are written; they, therefore, seem to be entirely engaged in their own devotion, consisting of prostrations, bowings, kissing of the ikons, and burning little tapers before them. The offices are invariably intoned, as well as all recitations of Scripture, certain final syllables being prolonged, and sometimes inflected; other parts are regularly chanted, both by priest and choir; the musical notation is peculiar, and requires a distinct study: it seems

—if we may venture a conjecture—to be derived rather from the system of Hebrew accents than to be connected with the western form. Dr. Littledale, in the work before us, tells us what tones the hymns are to be sung to; it is, however, by no means easy for the ear to catch the particular tone, from the fact of such a number of running notes being introduced; the original form is almost lost. No organ or musical instruments seem ever to be allowed, everything is left to the voice alone; the only approach to an instrument that the writer ever saw or heard was in an Armenian church, where a brass dirk, at the end of a pole, borne by one of the choir boys, surrounded by little bells, like the French *grelots*, was occasionally jingled—there is no other word that expresses the sound—during the chanting; something of the same kind, though in shape more manifestly Tatar, is still in use in the Sultan's military band. The vocal part is, to an English ear, exceedingly harsh and unpleasant, being sung in a very high key, and entirely nasal; in this respect resembling the Arabic and modern Jewish music; from the latter it seems to have been derived. It is certainly very ancient; for we read that when the Latins took Constantinople, they not only pillaged and destroyed all the beautiful furniture of the Church of S. Sophia, but they induced a vile woman to seat herself on the altar, and sing songs *through her nose* in derision of the Greek ecclesiastical music.

On the subject of hymnology, we read in note 52 as follows:—

“A canon is the fullest exemplification of the system employed by the Greek hymnodists. With the occasional exception of the Trimeter Iambics, there is no trace of the observance of the laws of metre or quantity in their compositions, which are in rhythmical prose, and regulated by accent alone. The amount of uniformity necessary to satisfy the ear is obtained by selecting one strophe as the syllabic and accentual model of succeeding ones, which answer to it in some degree as antistrophes. This strophe is called the *Hirmos* (ἑρμός), because it joins together, and draws after it the succeeding strophes, which are called *troparia*, from turning (τρέπω) to their model. Any number of these *troparia*, with their *Hirmos*, constitutes an ode, and nine such odes form a perfect canon. . . . Every ode ends with a *Theotokion*, or hymn in honour of the Blessed Virgin; and occasionally we find intercalated other hymns, called severally *Kathismata*, *Katabasiai*, or *Oicoi*. A short hymn, which is its own model, and not based on any other *Hirmos*, is called *Automelon* or *Ideomelon*, and if, (as frequently happens,) others resembling it succeed it, they are called *Homœa* (ὁμοία). Sometimes a system of such hymns is found grouped together, in which case they are collectively called *Prosomœa*.”—Pp. 279, 280.

Our readers must bear in mind that the modern Greek knows nothing of classical *quantity* in his pronunciation of the language; he is entirely guided by the accent. To perceive the rhythm of a hymn, the Anglican reader must attend solely to the accent. The

hymns are all destitute of rhyme ; in this respect also they resemble all oriental poetry, as distinguished from western.

The prayers also possess their own features, differing considerably from the western form ; they are frequently very long, reciting facts and pleading former mercies, contrasting strongly with the terse form of the western collect ; in this respect also, they seem to follow the Jewish model ; from the latter too apparently are derived the long prayers in use among the Mohammedan Dervishes. Moreover, they seldom end with the common western formula, "through JESUS CHRIST our LORD," &c., though each Person of the Trinity is often mentioned, concluding with *νῦν, καὶ ἄρτι, καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*.

Another peculiarity in the Oriental form deserves mention. The sacramental formula is always in the *precativ*e mood, and not in the *indicative*, as the Western. Thus in Holy Baptism, it is not "I baptize thee," but "the servant of God (N.) is baptized in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST." Again, the Prayer of Absolution after Death, runs thus : "The LORD JESUS CHRIST, our God, Who gave His Divine command to His holy disciples and apostles, to bind and to loose the sins of the fallen, and we in turn having received from them the authority to do the same, may He pardon thee, my spiritual child, if thou hast committed any fault voluntary or involuntary, in this world, now," &c., (p. 166.)

Having pointed out a few of the peculiarities of the printed forms, we may now come to Dr. Littledale's volume. We hail it with pleasure, hoping that it is an instalment of a series which will make us acquainted with the ritual and offices of a Church, of which our own divines are disgracefully ignorant. The book contains eighteen offices, together with the "great collect," and the "little collect," (*συνάπτη*), one of which generally accompanies other offices ; fifteen are Occasional Offices ; the other three are what we should call the First Vespers of the three Great Feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost. The fifteen are as follows :—
 1. Litany of the Deacon ; 2. Prayers at the making of a Catechumen ; 3. Office of Holy Baptism ; 4. Ordination of a Deacon ; 5. Ordination of a Deaconess ; 6. Ordination of a Priest ; 7. When the Bishop makes a Confessor ; 8. Consecration of a Bishop ; 9. Office of Confession ; 10. Prayer of Absolution after Death ; 11. Foundation of a Church ; 12. Fixing of the Cross ; 13. Re-opening of a Church defiled by Heretics ; 14. Ditto desecrated by heathens ; 15. Prayer for those who offer First-fruits. Thus we have here, as it were, specimens of all the different kinds of offices in use in the Orthodox Church. The Office for the Ordination of a Deaconess, we are told in a note, has only an archeological interest, for it has been unused in the Eastern Church since the twelfth century, and it had become very rare long before that date.

Some of our readers will thank us for the following extract from the "Notes" of this book.

"It is necessary to say a few words about the Canonical Hours of the Eastern Church before proceeding to deal with the Festal Offices printed here.

"They are nearly the same in order, though not in construction, as those of the West.

"They are as follows :

"1. Ἑσπερινόν, Vespers.

"2. Ἀπόδειπνον, Compline.

"3. Μεσονυκτικόν, Matins.

"4. Ὁρθρον, Lauds.

"5. Prime.

"6. Terce.

"7. Sext.

"8. None.

"After each of these four last there is a μεσώριον or intermediate office."—P. 275.

Dr. Littledale has printed the Offices in Greek, and added an English translation, illustrated by valuable notes, and has added a glossary, chiefly collected from Du Cange, of all the ecclesiastical terms, not found in ordinary Lexicons; many of them being purely Romaic. We must, however, enter our complaint against the author's orthography of Greek words; he is not consistent with himself, and therefore misleads his readers. There are two ways of writing Greek words in English characters, one by substituting the corresponding English letters for the Greek without regard to sound, the other by substituting those English letters which convey the sound of the Greek; the latter is that adopted by the Latin writers, and is doubtless the best. Dr. Littledale adopts both practices on no rule that we can discover, and only causes confusion.

We trust the sale of the present volume will prove such a success, that Dr. Littledale will be induced to commence a more systematic publication of the Offices of the Orthodox Church, both in Greek and English. If we may venture a suggestion, we should recommend him to bring out a volume containing the Offices for the six Sacraments,—omitting, of course, the Liturgies, which are already accessible: another giving us all the other Occasional Offices; and then the Canonical Hours. Such a series would be invaluable to the Ritualist.

OWEN'S PILGRIMAGE TO ROME.

The Pilgrimage to Rome: a Poem in Two Parts. By R. OWEN, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Oxford: H. Hammans. 1863.

THERE is certainly no subject more calculated to test the powers of a writer than this which Mr. Owen has chosen as the theme of his verse. Learning of every kind and a refined taste, reverence and impartiality, together with descriptive powers of the highest order, are needed, in order to do justice to it; while failure must necessarily involve a shock to some of the tenderest sensibilities of our nature.

If any one doubts the truth of this statement, let him take up Mr. Storey's *Roba di Roma*, a work by no means devoid of talent, but written throughout—whenever the subject of religion at all comes in—in a tone the most flippant and prejudiced.

Mr. Owen's accomplishments, both as an historian and a divine, were well known to us; but we have seen so many, of whom we had hoped better things, drawn, either into sentimentality on the one hand, or bigotry on the other, when confronted with the actual metropolis of the great Roman Communion, that we feared even if the author of *Dogmatic Theology* would be able to hold the scales of judgment with perfect evenness. Moreover, we could not but remember "*Poeta nascitur non fit.*"

Our fears, we are glad to say, were speedily dissipated, as we turned over page after page, and noted not only general elegance of language and musicalness of rhythm, but also, from time to time, poetic merit of no mean order. The following short ode, commemorative of S. Peter's, will justify, we think, this favourable criticism:—

"A rosary of lamps both night and day
Is burning in the glorious house of prayer;
O! Christian, bend in reverence and pray,
For Peter's dust and Paul's is slumbering there!

"Not mid the sylvan solitudes that lave
Their blossoms in the Galilæan deep,
Nor by the snow-fed Cydnus' cooling wave,
Those heroes of the Gospel fell on sleep.

"But here they rest, where, combating with death,
Their happy souls the victors' garland won;
Where with a blessing sped their sacred breath
Here in the arms of Roman Babylon.

- "Two olive branches blended here so fair;
 The one, the Orient garden's wealthy child,
 Fed by the dews of heaven and mellowed air;
 The other was the oleander wild.
- "The stranger was by Mercy grafted in
 To aid, but not to quench the sap divine,
 Which in the elder olive did begin
 The life which evermore knows no decline.
- "O! great Apostles, Keeper of Heaven's keys,
 And Teacher of the Gentiles! where are flown
 The hopes of early days, the promised fees
 Of the rich fields by you together sown?
- "Two radiant flocks the Master bade you feed,
 And here ye fed them in the golden Rome;
 How are they scattered in an hour of need,
 Those fair sheep folded in your chosen home!"

Pp. 111—113.

A few archaic phrases might perhaps be altered with advantage; but, upon the whole, Mr. Owen's views respecting Italy tend more in the direction of Progress than some of our readers will approve. A sober, religious tone, however, is the general characteristic of these pages, which, while it is by no means the apologist for doctrinal error or social abuses, can recognize whatever is good and catholic in the Roman system, and regards the Church as endowed with an elasticity and power of adaptation by means of which it should be abundantly able to cope with all the diversified evils of this and every age. Witness the following:—

"Hard by the Seine a sacred temple stands,
 Whose hoary front proclaims its sovran eld;
 Dear in the name it bears of him, who fought
 For CHRIST and Cambria in the dreary times—
 The patriot saint, Germanus of Auxerre.
 Most fitting place to muse at eventide,
 From all the busy strife of tongues retired;
 And seek communion with the GOD of Peace
 Mid the hushed stillness of those shadowy piers:
 Illumined, where those western lights reveal
 The regal forms of Pepin, and of Karl,
 Who ruled at Aachen with his Paladins,
 A glorious sun in winter's droopy day;
 And where the flood of golden splendour pours
 Adown the orphreyed cope of Hildebrand.
 Here might an ardent mind in fancy rove,
 Steeped in the dreams of long-departed power;
 And mourn the Church's loss of temporal sway,
 At which the nations quailed in feudal times,
 Spanned by the gorgeous arch of Papacy;—

Might mourn in vain ; for sure the holy Faith
 Lost her pure lustre, when she first assumed
 The purple robe and Cæsar's diadem ;
 Even as the rainbow, gemmed with heavenly hues,
 Melts when it meets the cold embrace of earth.
 Peace, idle dreamer, wake to real themes !
 The Church of France, now in the seething oil
 Of sore disquietude but ill disguised,
 May win a richer guerdon from on high
 Than e'er befell in mediæval pomp,—
 The Gospel guerdon of the crown of thorns ;
 To be unto her blessed LORD conformed
 In deeds of love and holy suffering.
 Religion is not exiled from the land,
 Though sins abound and scoffers multiply ;
 Though Lyons hides in her portentous womb
 Dark store of ills in mercy yet withheld ;
 Yet is Bretagne the land of loyalty,
 And o'er the waste of her deserted sands
 Rests the dim shadow of the awful cross.
 Still in the heart of France, mid wreck of thrones,
 And commonwealths by giddy men devised,
 Faith breathes her spell of solemn sweetness ; still
 Illumes the heart in sorrow's dark abode,
 Soothes every care, and lightens every fear.
 Her Prelates' modest fortune now may show
 Fairer ensample than the princely pride
 And worldly splendour erst unchastened, save
 In kindly Meaux and tranquil Fenelon.
 Her Christian Brothers, with industrious toil
 And burning love of souls, the livelong night
 And day moreover in assiduous round
 Let down the net to catch the souls of men,—
 Vincent of Paul's true-hearted progeny !
 Nor lack there yet, to cleanse the unhallowed air,
 Bundles of myrrh from blooming Gilead,
 The Church's tenderest offering, when she brings
 The choice devotion of the woman's heart ;
 Setting before our eyes that holy train,
 Once led by Love Divine from Galilee
 To clasp with faithful arms His bleeding cross,
 Like lilies twining round His trysting-tree."—Pp. 5—8.

One other extract on the monastic system must not be withheld :—

"Their place knows them no more. Their gorgeous domes
 Have faded in the unsubstantial mist
 Of ever-growing Eld. The Spirit, which dwelt
 In lonely majesty within those towers,
 Now from his home expelled, is left at large
 To choose his habitation. Let him roam

Untrammelled by the perishable forms,
Which for their season shrined both Faith and Love;
Let him go forth with healing on his wings,
The mighty spirit of Ascetic Zeal,
Dispensing blessings wide as waters flow
Around the myriad isles and continents;
Let him go forth, and light the unending toil
Of Missioners, who bear the mystic Cross
To the wild tribes far in the heathen lands,
A Comforter most potent and secure!

“He whose perplexed office is to mould
And shape into harmonious unity
The infant struggles of a settler's home;
And with the golden crook of pastoral love
To win the heathen from his salvage rites
And from the barren wilderness of thought
Into green pastures of a holy hope;—
He needs a double portion of deep zeal
And self-denying patience, such as wrought
In saintly Bernard and the hermits old,
In fuller gift bestowed,—nor needs in vain.
Behold! the noble Maōri, mid the fray
And fierce heart-writhings with the stranger host,
List to the voice of love, in accents clear
Breathed by his own Apostle, Father, Friend;
(Such titles might the Bishop best beseem,
Himself a stranger, but the donor blest
Of spiritual boons that earthly hopes surpass!)—
List to that voice, and drinks the soothing sound
That from the Gospel message rings so pure!”—P. 42, 43.

MR. GLADSTONE ; HIS CONSTITUENCY, AND POLITICS.

The Times, Thursday, April 16, 1863.

It is not surprising that Mr. Gladstone should have staggered his staunchest supporters, and stirred up his least vehement opponents, by his late freak anent the Dissenters' Burial Bill. Had he, like his discreet colleague, Sir Roundell Palmer, simply contented himself with silence and absence on the division, or with a speech characteristically misty, and capable of a double construction, without voting, his political relationship and understanding with his constituents would not have been much materially altered. Habitual crotchety and eccentricity, or a far-sighted policy, would have

still explained what was ambiguous in his seeming inconsistency. After an involuntary haw and ahem in the *Guardian*, and a gulp and yawn on the part of its confiding but sleepy readers, he would have been borne with and let alone until the next general election, and then probably returned by a decreased number of begrudged votes without a contest. For a formidable competitor, with a fair prospect of success, is not yet forthcoming; and none other would be thought to justify a breach of the traditional *laissez faire* precedent of University representation. But when the name of the Right Hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer appeared in the division-list paired with that of Lord E. H. Trevor on the side of the minority of ayes to the second reading of the Bill, even his most overweening apologists were driven to sore straits to suggest a plausible explanation, and, it may be presumed, to reduce their own opinions on the subject to a satisfactory conclusion. His out-and-out admirers, of course, still prate vaguely about his being fifty years in advance of the present generation, and seeing far ahead into the dim twentieth century. Others pay more questionable compliments to his sagacity in taking in the ultra-Radicals; or, alleging his personal ambition, discover in his course of politics a deliberate insult, expressive of contempt for his present constituency, and his desire to be set free from it, like his old master, Peel, in order to ingratiate himself more unrestrictedly into popular favour, by representing the wider and more material class interests of a less critical and less delicate community. Such hollow and somewhat smoky vapourings are probably as wide of the true mark as the wholesale imputation of dishonest motive on the adverse side; but they are suggestive of an escape from a dilemma. We, too, have our own ideas upon the subject; and we proceed in the present paper, not for the first time, to draw these out into some more definite and intelligible form of theory.

Ten years ago, just after Mr. Dudley Perceval's abortive contest for the University seat, our pages contained an article under the same title, wherein we endeavoured to set forth our view of the leading principle of Mr. Gladstone's politics, in which the *specialty* of his political character consisted. "He appears to us (we said) to stand alone among statesmen of the day, in his clear perception and realization of the *essential independence* of the Church—her Divine, mystical, sacramental, transcendental nature, superior to worldly politics, though of course incidentally entering into them, and to temporalities of every kind."¹ We still adhere to our belief in the truth of this conception. We have no reason to suppose any change in the religious opinions of the Right Honourable gentleman; we have no reason whatever to doubt, but quite the reverse, the soundness and sincerity of his appreciation of Catholic principles. We have lately been assured of the weighty private

¹ *Ecclesiastic*, No. iii. (N. S.), March, 1853, p. 141.

influence exercised by him in resisting the miserable compromise proposed between some of the English and Scotch Bishops for the extrusion of the National Office from the latter Church. And we hear of him, after a late severe accident, which, as we say (humanly speaking), might so easily have proved fatal, finding sympathy and a fit outlet for his gratitude in the Easter services of one of the most elaborately ritualistic of our London Churches. We believe him to be wholly incapable of following the bad example of an unsuccessful candidate for the representation of the sister University, by repudiating all his past professions and associations in Church matters, or demeaning himself to disown the stigma of a religious party name. But moral tergiversation at least cannot be fairly charged against him. And, on the other hand, we are perfectly ready to re-endorse our former estimate of his high general qualifications as a Representative of the University: "Personally religious, and Catholic minded in all questions of religion, he is singularly qualified to give weight and popularity to his principles by his tact and political experience, his clear-headedness, sobriety, depth, gravity, eloquence, and, moreover, his unimpeachable disinterestedness and honesty."¹ We are all the more eager to advance these arguments in favour of Mr. Gladstone's future candidature, because we are as sensibly conscious of certain counter-considerations which press forcibly in a contrary direction; and we seem to see clear reasons for distrusting his late conduct in the matter of the Burial Bill, even on his own principles, and those which we held with him in common. To these two points we shall presently address ourselves.

But we must first clear the ground a little by a few preliminary observations. Mr. Gladstone would claim, we presume,—at any rate his friends claim for him,—to be ranked with that section of politicians who are accurately enough described under the party-title "Liberal-Conservatives." What then is implied in that claim? and does he fulfil the conditions on which the hypothesis rests? By a Liberal-Conservative we understand the *tertium quid* evolved by a combination of the Liberal and Conservative. He is something different from both, and is supposed by assimilating in his own politics the distinguishing principles of each to neutralize or correct whatever is extreme or bad in either. These principles may as intelligibly and compendiously as any way be distinguished by reference to their contrasted bearing on Representative Government and institutions. A Liberal in his political conduct has primary regard to the rights or interests of the majority; a Conservative, to those of a minority. The one tendency in exaggeration will run up into the root-and-branch levelling enormities of ultra-Radicalism; the other into the unreasoning dogged obstructiveness ascribed (unjustly often in the case of in-

¹ *Eccelesiastic*, No. iii. (N. S.), March, 1853, p. 140.

dividuals) to the old-fashioned Tory and the national abstraction, *John Bull*. The Liberal-Conservative is, by hypothesis, the golden *via media* between the two extremes; the Nemesis with even balances meting out their due proportions to both the majority and minority in the crowd of hungry claimants. *Quoad* Liberal, he will acknowledge a sympathizing partiality for the unrepresented classes; *quoad* Conservative, he will observe a due regard and make allowance for the rights of property, and law; meaning, however, by *property*, not simply private possessions and inherited estates, but actual personal acquisitions of whatever kind, vested interests, customary privileges, even inveterate prejudices, and recognized etiquette; whatever claim can plead the nine points of the unwritten law of custom in its favour. A Liberal-Conservative, of course, like other men, will have his natural leanings dependent on his own temperament or education. He will be more of a Liberal, or more of a Conservative, as it happens; and in some cases, his distinctive identity as a Liberal-Conservative will fade away into either pure Liberalism or pure Conservatism.

Such then is the political position claimed for Mr. Gladstone. His hereditary associations, and his financial ability, would naturally give him a bias towards the commercial interests of the trading and middle classes. His highly cultivated mind, his extensive reading, his refined classical taste, his singular powers of analysis and logic, his moral qualities also, his sober judgment, his love of truth and justice, his candour, his sympathy, his religiousness, his Catholicity,—his whole character in short would lead him to get at the bottom of a subject and cast off all extraneous matter before pronouncing upon it; to act upon naked principle, rather than expediency; to detest and abhor in politics whatever savours of what in other departments we should call priggishness, pedantry, prudery, bigotry; and with a chivalrous disregard for consequences to vote generously with the weaker side. Like all earnest characters, however, his, we opine, is not exempt from the fallacy of onesidedness and exaggeration. He would push a principle to the utmost; and so long as an asserted grievance or claim of right admitted of a *lawful* remedy, he would, we imagine, make but small account whether the measure was *expedient* also.

We have already supposed that one leading principle of his politics is the *essential independence of the Church*. Private judgment (in its true meaning), toleration, the essential liberty and equal rights of individual citizens, are necessarily included in this notion. The Church is independent (so far as this world is concerned,) because people may submit to and belong to it or not, just as they choose; it does not lean on the carnal arm; it does not trust to the civil sword; its constraints are simply spiritual and moral. So far indeed as its temporalities are concerned, it

enters necessarily into earthly politics; its temporalities are secured to it and stand exactly on the same ground of right and law as those of any other national institution; it is subject to "the Royal Supremacy," i.e. to civil legislation and administration, just like any other; but its temporalities are not of the essence of the Church, and must not interfere with the rights or liberties of other citizens. When then any question should arise affecting the special interests of the Church, Mr. Gladstone, we apprehend, would be apt to take this simple view of it, on its own intrinsic merits. When once a grievance were alleged and a remedy proposed, his first question would be, did the proposed relief touch the essence of the Church? if not, there would be a *prima facie* reason for conceding it. A grievance is admitted to exist; get rid of it by all means. *Civis sum* is a sufficient title for an indulgent hearing. No class of British subjects should be left with a reasonable ground of complaint still unremedied. This sheer simplicity of view, this political *purism*, we consider, has been the *primum fallax* at the bottom of the Right Hon. Gentleman's aberrations—the rock upon which he has split, as well on other occasions, as most signally on that of the Dissenters' Burial Bill. We need not quote here the famous passage of Macaulay, about speculative and practical legislation. Mr. Gladstone's eccentricities are notoriously on the former side. In calculating the orbit of his comet course before he takes it, he does not always make sufficient allowance for disturbing forces; he keeps his eye fixed too directly on the major and minor *foci* of his hypothetical ellipse, and will not turn aside to take a survey of other bodies coming across the path and diverting the curve of his projectile. The result of course is error and collision. And so it has happened in this particular case. The effect of the proposed measure, if it were carried, would most certainly have been *the substitution of the grievance of a majority for the grievance (if it be such) of a minority*. There is no subject on which the minds and hearts of English Churchmen generally are more keenly sensitive and earnest, than the sacredness of their dead, their burial places, and funeral ceremonials. We have seen the feeling resentfully asserted, the battle successfully fought out in more than one of our colonies, where compromise and coalition have been attempted, but which (we dare say, universally,) have resulted in a separate burial-ground for the Church of England, Roman Catholics, and Protestant Dissenters. The principle is recognized and accepted as if beyond the possibility of contest in our own cemetery-system at home, with its consecrated and unconsecrated precincts, and their distinctive chapels attached. We do not care, therefore, to question the reality of the alleged grievance in this case, which is one of sentiment, but of sentiment equally affecting the two parties to the question, and which no compromise of the kind proposed could by possibility satisfy. We

do not say that *no* sufficient remedy could be provided by legislation, for that is beside the present question; none other has been suggested, though the cemetery-system just referred to seems to point out one solution of the difficulty, and there are not many of our old churchyards, whether in country or in town, which do not demand the relief of some additional burial ground. But it is absurd to imagine that one grievance can be cured by the substitution of another.

It is not at all surprising, then, we repeat, that men of practical common sense, should find a difficulty in accepting views so extremely subtle and simple, as those arising out of what we suppose to be the leading principle of Mr. Gladstone's politics, and have been especially amazed at his conduct on the late occasion. The Right Hon. Gentleman himself seems to have had some misgivings as to the soundness of his position, if an unusual stammering and hesitation of speech is truly attributed to him. But his conduct appears to us rather an instance of the exaggeration of an earnest, clear-headed theorist, pushing his principle too far, ignoring the countervail of qualifying circumstances, and confounding the *lawful* with the *expedient*, than of inconsistency with his former self. Ten years ago, as we pointed out at the time, the attachment of his supporters was any thing but confiding and enthusiastic; it was rather a making the best of a questionable bargain, a preference of a *more* to a *less* satisfactory candidate. But even then we found High Churchmen of the hyper-national and hyper-Catholic schools, (Archdeacon Denison and Mr. Bennett of Frome,) sitting together on the committee of the opposition; men too, as we suppose, liberal in their politics. The truth is and must be said, Mr. Gladstone certainly does not represent the mind and opinions of the University. All thick and thin supporters of Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli, can of course have no cordial sympathy with his line of politics; even Liberal-Conservatives and High Churchmen of the Church and State class, ultra Anglicans, and much more ultra Protestants, are banded together in positive opposition to him. Nay, even those who once cordially supported him, liberals in politics and Catholics in religion, are now divided in opinion; and the residue, who still prefer him to any competitor who has yet entered an appearance, consider that his parliamentary services to the Church would be equally available and less embarrassed, because less suspected, in union with the representation of a more popular constituency. In short, the only difficulty, and it is a very serious practical difficulty, is the choice, we do not say of an equally able, but of a religious and trustworthy successor. We confess that we entertain the utmost jealousy of the timid hesitating moderate sort of men, given to compromise and concession, with which the conservative ranks, not least of the political parties, abound, and of which the sister University, on more than one try-

ing occasion, has unpleasantly felt the incubus. It is not without significance, that Mr. Gladstone, in the most recent instance of his eccentricity, was able to quote Mr. Walpole and Mr. Sotheron Estcourt, as his authorities for the reality of the alleged grievance and a justification for his support of a second reading of the Bill.

Several names that have already been put forward as feelers for the candidature, are unhappily of this stamp. Others of the Dudley Perceval, Round, and Dr. Marsham school, would of course simply ensure the return again of Mr. Gladstone. But if, in the meantime, a man, "thorough" in Church principles, and of sufficient ability, tact, and Parliamentary experience to recommend them, and much more of proved decision of character and singleness of purpose, to stand by them when contested—if such can anyhow be induced to come forward, we cannot doubt of his success; and if a contest was spared by the timely withdrawal of Mr. Gladstone, we, among others of his sincere admirers, should be all the better pleased.

MR. DANIEL MOORE'S LENTEN SERMON AT OXFORD.

It is really very cruel of the Bishop of Oxford to decoy persons down to Oxford to take part in a course of sermons, who have no notion what a Theological Division is. The Bishop has attached to himself a certain "company of preachers," who are always ready to follow in his train, and who, although not of course all equal to one another, (for some are amongst the first preachers of the day,) much less to himself, do not at least ordinarily expose themselves. It would appear, however, that his Lordship's staff is not quite sufficient for all occasions when their services are required. Accordingly, the number has usually to be supplemented by one or two outsiders.

It would be easy for the Bishop at these times, one would suppose, to find a few sound divines, who, if their manner were not quite up to the approved popular standard, would at least not discredit the company in which they unexpectedly find themselves. Instead of this, however, the Bishop seems to us to take pleasure, (if it were not for his office, we should call it a *malicious* pleasure,) in decoying down some hero from Exeter Hall, or the Dublin May Meetings, whose self-love hurries him on to swallow the bait voraciously. At first, these gentlemen do not discover the mistake that they have made; but it is seldom that they appear more than twice at Oxford, or elsewhere. We do not mean, of course, that the Golden Lecturer is exactly one of this class; he has already, we believe, survived the fatal test before referred to, at Oxford. But this year has been too much for him; for first, by some mischance, he stum-

bled on what is perhaps the most difficult of the Bishop's subjects, "the SPIRIT witnessing with our spirit that we are the children of God," and secondly, by the unforeseen accident of the presence of the Dean of Westminster—the appointed preacher for the night—being commanded at Windsor, he has been obliged to print his sermon as well as preach it, which thus fell into the S. Mary's series, instead of being delivered at S. Giles'!

Imagine poor Mr. Moore's perplexity. In the first place, he has evidently no clear idea how and when any one is made "the child of God," and having a wholesome dread of a controversy about regeneration, he treads in the tenderest manner on that treacherous ground, which he knows, has engulfed so many before him. He does not quite deny its connection with the Sacrament of Baptism, but he tells us that "the *believer's saving and confirmed* reception into God's family, is no overt act; it belongs to the deep, silent, unfathomed actings of the Eternal Mind."

The time when Regeneration takes place, being in this manner uncertain, the preacher very much needs some undeniable witness to the fact when it occurs. A man's own spirit, in the first place, attests the fact, and there, doubtless, Mr. Moore would be glad to leave the matter; but unfortunately, the Apostle speaks of two witnesses. And how is this to be explained? explained, that is, so as not to conflict with the received canon of Protestantism, that a man's works cannot possibly enter into the question of his salvation.

Mr. Moore seems fully conscious of the difficulty, and so he begins in this deprecatory tone. "Well, generally we mean this, that he has a happy *sense* of reconciliation . . ." "The SPIRIT of God in His Word, insisting on certain commanded *feelings*, and our own spirit testifying that we have such *feelings*." In this manner Mr. Daniel Moore reduces the two witnesses to one, which is practically the doctrine of assurance. But then he appears to have a misgiving that this view, as he expresses it, "would unparadise the souls of many," because many good people have died without any such assurance. And so he is actually obliged to end with contradicting S. Paul, and affirms that after all, we "may fail of such experience!"

In the tangles of this maze we must leave Mr. Moore, only venturing this piece of advice, that before he undertakes to preach again to an educated audience, he stipulates that he shall be allowed to choose his own subject, and not be required to publish his sermon. We would advise him also very strongly to read a sermon of Bishop Sherlock's, on the same text, from which we will give him the benefit of one quotation. "So then you have two ways of judging yourselves, which must both concur. You have inward and outward signs of grace. The inward signs are, a pure conscience, a sincere love for God and religion, and whatsoever tends to the glory and honour of your Maker. The outward signs are, acts of obedience conformable to the inward purity and

love of your mind. These are fruits by which you may judge yourselves. Our SAVIOUR tells us that we 'may know men by their fruits;' much rather may we know ourselves by our own fruits. Hence it appears, that the evidence of the SPIRIT is not any secret inspiration or any assurance conveyed to the mind of the faithful, but it is the evidence of works such as by the SPIRIT we perform."

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. "*Give ye them to eat.*" A Sermon on the two Duties of observing Lent as an Apostolic Institution, and of caring for CHRIST'S Poor, preached at All Saints', Margaret Street, on Refreshment Sunday, 1863. By the Rev. CHARLES GUTCH, B.D., Assistant-Curate. Revised and enlarged with an Appendix. "Church Review" Office.
2. *The Daily Service.* A Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Diss, on the Sunday after Christmas, 1862. By the Rev. P. S. WILSON, M.A. Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker.

WE join together in one notice two Sermons, which prove that the world is not yet allowed to have at all its own way among us. Some revulsion of feeling on both the duties here advocated, might reasonably be expected, because it is perfectly true that the check of experience was needed, in order to ascertain what the average physical constitution of Priest and People can bear, whether as regards work or fasting. We can well remember how, when the fact first dawned upon us, that the laws of the Church were habitually violated, not in some single particular, but in the mass, there was a general indisposition to listen to excuses, and many were for pressing a literal observance of Rubrics at all costs. An enlarged acquaintance with human nature, and with the Church's history, soon showed that a power of dispensation in such matters must reside somewhere. And now the difficulty is to know in what manner this check must be administered. Too many are disposed to "cut the knot," by doing every man not even we fear what is *right*, but what is *convenient* in his own eyes. We are thankful, therefore, to Mr. Gutch and Mr. Wilson, in their respective spheres, for bringing us back to contemplate what is the rule of the Church in two important Church duties. The latter of the two enforces his subject by the authority of some of the most esteemed English Divines. Mr. Gutch has the more difficult task of disposing of the authority of Taylor and Bingham, which, as usual, are on the lax side. This he does very satisfactorily in his Preface and Appendix, which are of very considerable dimensions.

Those who consider that religion consists in excitement, will perhaps be disappointed in the sketch of *The Life of Betty Adamson, a Lancashire Mill-Girl*, by the Rev. T. THORNTON. (Rivingtons.) A neighbouring clergyman inquired, Mr. Thornton tells us, if nothing could be said about her "conversion." But upon the same principle that we prefer whole limbs and sound constitutions to cures, however marvellous, so assuredly a gradual growth in holiness is the condition

of the soul most of all to be desired. We thank Mr. Thornton, therefore, very sincerely for his careful and modest memoir.

The Rev. CYPRIAN RUST has just put forth a little tract on *The Three Creeds*. (Wertheim and Co.) It is intentionally a defence of them against the theory of private judgment, but in doing so he makes an admission, which, if true, would do much more than counterbalance all his own deductions. It is to the effect that we know nothing of the Church's history from the martyrdom of SS. Peter and Paul to that of S. Polycarp, from A.D. 65 to A.D. 116. He does not forget that the Apocalypse of S. John was written about the year 90, but he asserts that this is not history. Of course it is not, but it is by no means without historical significance on one of the points which Mr. Rust represents to be at issue, viz., the constitution of the Christian Church. When the Spirit thrice addressed the Angel of the Church of Smyrna, and the others enumerated, it is surely as plain a demonstration of the existence of episcopacy as could be desired. But what becomes of S. Ignatius? He is supposed to have suffered martyrdom in 107, and he was consecrated Bishop, some say in 69, others in 67. Whether then we look to his own personal history, or to his well known epistle which certainly places the threefold ministry on the highest conceivable pedestal of authority, the gap which Mr. Rust imagines, and afterwards extends to a hundred years, altogether vanishes. We believe this is the first reprint that has been ventured on from "The Christian Advocate and Review." If Mr. Rust is a fair sample of its contributors, what must we think of the intelligence of its readers? *Si volunt decipi decipiantur*.

Scripture Reading Lessons for Little Children (Masters) belong to the picturesque style of writing which has become so fashionable, and is a very good specimen of its kind, the words not running away, as is too often the case, with the sense, or destroying the analogy of the faith.

There are some misapprehensions in reference to the Negro Race, which Mr. CRUMMELL, who appears to be a Missionary in Liberia, successfully refutes in his little tract published by Wertheim. We cannot agree with him however in thinking that the curse was pronounced on Canaan alone, and not on Ham.

The S. P. C. K. and the National Society have combined to produce us a volume of *English History* in their "New Reading Series," which is more offensive in its religious tone, and altogether more unworthy, than any manual of the kind we ever met with. The ten centuries of the British and Saxon period are despatched in eighteen pages, and fifty more bring us to the Reformation. We are then introduced to a description of the Church's faith and practice, which practically lowers Mediæval Christianity to a lower level than that of heathenism. The doctrine of a Eucharistic Sacrifice is altogether denied, and Luther is represented as the discoverer of religious truth. Comparing this book with those of Archdeacon Sinclair and Mr. Gleig, which were published some years since by the S. P. C. K., this is a decided retrograde movement, and shows very forcibly that the effort which is now being made to get some better names on the Committee of the S. P. C. K. than at present appear there, is much needed.

MR. KEBLE'S LIFE OF BISHOP WILSON.

The Life of the Right Reverend Father in God, Thomas Wilson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. Compiled chiefly from original documents. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., Vicar of Hursley. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1863.

It is now almost two hundred years since the birth of Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man, than whom, among all our devotional writers, or those eminent for personal holiness, in the English Church, there is no one whose name has stood higher. The "*Sacra Privata*," and "*Introduction to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*," and other of his works, have been more widely circulated among Churchmen than almost any other religious books in the English language, and have had an extensive influence in moulding the belief and practice of high and low alike. Unfortunately, these works have suffered greatly at the hands of editors. Alterations of important words and suppressions of unpalatable doctrines have too often been permitted with a view of fitting the treatises for the Protestant mind. Yet even so, the purity, loyalty, and Catholic spirit of the good Bishop exhibit themselves in every page; and in the new edition, published under the editorship of the venerable author of the "*Christian Year*," we have, as far as they may be recovered, the very words of the writer, and can follow the orthodoxy, gentleness, firmness, and good sense of Wilson, without fear of glosses or "adaptations."

Of the previous biographies of Bishop Wilson, one, and the earliest, was compiled by the original editor of his works, the Rev. Clement Cruttwell, who, when a Surgeon at Bath, had had for many years under his care Dr. Wilson, the Bishop's son, and who, having been entrusted by him with the editing of his father's works, was won by his author's example and writings to relinquish the Medical profession and to take Holy Orders. This life is well-meaning and honest, but brief and imperfect. The second is that written by the Rev. Hugh Stowell, who, though an amiable and thoughtful writer, yet owing to the narrow views of the school to which he belonged, was unable fully to appreciate the vital excellence of Wilson's character, and too often strove to make the facts before him subserve his own predilections, regardless of consistency, and regarding the acts and documents of a Catholic-minded Prelate through the haze of semi-Calvinism. Mr. Keble's biography, which, we believe, forms the concluding volume of the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, is, as our readers well know, the work of one who can do full justice to the Bishop's personal holiness and consistent Churchmanship. It is perhaps rather heavy reading, and

wanting in some of those graces and ornaments which the literary taste of the present age desires. The copious extracts from letters and other documents, printed with the contractions and doubtful spelling of the originals, add somewhat to the dryness of the narrative. But these things show the entire fairness and careful labour of the compiler; and we rise from the perusal of the work with a definite and faithful picture upon our mind, and are able to form clear notions of Bishop Wilson's intellect, character, and acts—what he was in his family, in his diocese, and in himself.

Thomas Wilson was born December 20, 1663, at Burton, a village situated on the river Dee, about eight miles west of Chester. His father, Nathaniel Wilson, was a farmer upon a small scale and of inconsiderable means; but the family had been settled in that part of Cheshire from time immemorial, and were very generally known and respected. His mother was sister of Dr. Richard Sherlock, the author of "*The Practical Christian*," who had for some time been Chaplain to Charles, son of the great James Earl of Derby. By this good man Thomas Wilson's education was carefully superintended, till he was placed under the care of an eminent schoolmaster at Chester, whence at the age of eighteen he was removed to Trinity College, Dublin, entering that university as a sizar. In the following year he obtained a scholarship. And here, as far as we know, his desire for academical distinction ceased. But he won for himself what was better than fame, the friendship of a wise and good man, who was capable of guiding him aright not only in the difficulties of youth, but in those more abnormal dangers and perplexities which sprang from the then unsettled condition of politics and religion. Wilson had entered College with the view of studying medicine, for which he exhibited peculiar aptitude; but the "unconscious training" which he had experienced under his uncle, and the persuasion of Michael Hewetson, the friend just mentioned, led him to forego his original intention, and to determine to devote himself to the service of the Church. Such early excellence had showed itself in him, so plainly had the purity of his life and the bent of his disposition pointed him out as a fit candidate for the ministry, that he was specially ordained Deacon at Kildare, without a title, and while still wanting many months of the legal age. On this occasion a very profitable paper of counsels was drawn up by Hewetson for his friend's use, which, whether we consider the intrinsic excellence of the advice, or the period at which it was composed, is very noteworthy. Herein "M. H. advises his dear T. W., now entered into Holy Orders," to peruse and consider the rubrics in the Prayer Book, to read the Articles and Canons at least once a year, to maintain the laws of the Church, and never to deviate from them, unless so commanded by the Ordinary; to observe the Festivals and Fasts; to say Matins and Evensong every day; reading, in addition, one chapter of the

Bible, and using private devotion. He is enjoined further never to miss the public service when it is in his power to attend it; never to turn his back on the Altar or the Priest during the time of Divine Service; to bow at the Name of Jesus; to turn to the East at the Creeds and *Gloria Patri*; to make obeisance on entering or leaving the Church, and on approaching or returning from the Altar. "When he has a cure of souls, T. W. is earnestly desired" to celebrate the Holy Eucharist as often as he can find sufficient communicants, and to teach his people that this is the most important of all Christian duties; in his sermons to avoid all useless speculations and "juvenile affectations of fine language, wit, and learning;" in his conversation to be grave; in his company to be select, and especially to forbear familiarity with the female sex.

The good advice thus offered Wilson had soon an opportunity of practising in a responsible sphere of duty by being licensed to the curacy of his uncle Dr. Sherlock's parish, Newchurch in Winwick, Feb. 10, 1687. Here he stayed for three years, Dr. Sherlock's successor retaining his services, till he was introduced to the notice of the Earl of Derby, and by him appointed his private Chaplain and tutor to his son. "It is probable," says Mr. Keble (p. 57), "that Wilson's prompt and steady acceptance of the Revolution principle in politics might be one reason why Lord William chose him" to fill this post; though it is also likely that Sherlock's connection with the house of Stanley may have given the Earl opportunities of judging of Wilson's character and attainments, and have predisposed him to notice with favour the nephew of so trusted a friend and counsellor. To the office which he held in the family of Lord Derby he added the Mastership of the Almshouse at Latham, which involved only such light duties as he could perform without difficulty. These employments brought him an income of £50 a year, which so far exceeded his wants that he dedicated a fifth of it to charitable purposes, having already for some time offered a tenth of his very humble resources to God. He remained at Knowsley for five years, beloved by all about him, and so thoroughly trusted and respected that he could venture to remonstrate with the Earl on his extravagance, and the neglect which allowed debts of long standing to remain unpaid, when a little attention to business and self-denial would have remedied these evils.

It was at the close of the year 1697 that Wilson was forced by the importunity of his friends to accept the Bishopric of Sodor and Man. The nomination to the see appertained to the Earls of Derby, as Lords of the Isle, the King having the right of confirming the appointment. This see had been vacant since the death of Dr. Baptiste Levinz in 1693, and was now filled up at the earnest request of Archbishop Sharp, supported by a threat of King William that he would take the matter into his own hands if any further delay occurred.

Regarded in a worldly point of view, the Bishopric of Sodor and Man was an inconsiderable piece of preferment; yet true to his principles the newly-created Prelate resolutely refused to increase his emoluments by accepting an additional benefice, the duties of which he could not personally perform. And there, for the long period of fifty-eight years, he continued happy and contented in his island-home, an example of high-minded consistency and self-denial, which has had but too few imitators. The new Bishop landed at Derby Haven, in the south of the island of Man, after a four days' voyage, on April 6, 1698. Whether he was impressed with the beauty of the prospects that met his eye in his approach to his future home, we have no opportunity of knowing, as he has left no record of his feelings on natural scenery. Probably he had little appreciation of the picturesque, or made little account of any, even the most refined, sensuous enjoyment. This would supply the reason of the small regard which he paid to ritual and church architecture, his practical mind and severe tastes making no allowance for the teaching of the eye, and the perception of æsthetical beauty. The awful sense of responsibility under which he entered upon his new functions, is well seen by the prayer which he wrote on his installation, and which is found, as most of our readers know, in the "*Sacra Privata*." And if ever a post needed the support of Divine grace, to enable its occupant to do his duty unflinchingly, to repair past neglect, and to endure hardness, surely that assistance was required for the Bishop of Man. It was not that the diocese was of any great extent—for indeed it had, and still has, but seventeen parishes, and none of them containing a large population—but it had been so commonly viewed as the stepping-stone to some better preferment, that even the able prelates who had ruled over it had made little impression upon the spiritual state of the inhabitants, and of late years it had been left entirely without superintendence. The finances were in a most dilapidated condition, the income not reaching £300 a year; the palace was in ruins, several churches in the same state, and the cathedral altogether useless. Add to this, there was a feeling of isolation and solitariness about the Bishopric of Man in those days, which made responsibilities weigh heavier, and common duties more onerous for lack of friendly sympathy and counsel. It may have been this want of companionship, combined, as certain entries in the "*Sacra Privata*" intimate, with weakness of the flesh, that drove the Bishop to enter the married state a few months after his consecration. His wife's name was Mary Patten, whose acquaintance he had made years before when he first came to Winwick, where she resided with her parents. She made him an admirable helper; she was "every way the companion of his soul; pious, devout, and charitable as himself."¹

¹ Page 121, from "*Cruttwell*."

On returning to his diocese, after he had been married six months, Wilson took himself seriously to task for his late distractions and negligences.

"Upon a serious review of my time past, I find that I have been too negligent of the duties of my calling; I do therefore resolve solemnly (being heartily sorry for what is past) that for the time to come I will rectify (by the grace of God) my ways in these following instances, viz.:

"First, more diligently follow my studies; secondly, immediately regulate my devotions, and attend them constantly; thirdly, preach more constantly than I have done; fourthly, compose prayers for the poor families, in order to have them printed; fifthly, endeavour with all my might to draw my heart from the care of the things of the world.

"And that I may not forget these purposes, I resolve that this memorandum shall remain as a record against me, until I have thoroughly amended in these particulars. The God of Heaven give me grace to set about the work immediately, and give me strength to finish it. Amen. Amen."—P. 122.

To these several resolutions he religiously adhered henceforward. His first public decision was unfortunate. A certain woman, wife of one Christopher Hampton, had been convicted of stealing a lamb, and sentenced to transportation for life. Her husband appealed to the Bishop to be allowed to marry again, his former wife being dead in the eye of the law, and received for answer the following decision:

"26th May, 1698.

"I have considered your petition, and I find nothing in it contrary to the rules of our holy religion, or the orders and determination of learned and judicious Christians in all ages; and, therefore, I give you liberty to make such a choice as shall be most for your support and comfort, and I pray God to direct you in it."—P. 108.

This reply was doubtless founded upon insufficient knowledge, and, as Mr. Keble says, bears marks of haste and inconsideration. Our Bishop sufficiently vindicated the sacredness and indissolubility of holy matrimony in other cases that came before him in after years, and was most strict in enforcing obedience to the laws of the Church regarding that ordinance. Thus he refused to sanction marriages at uncanonical seasons; he declared connection with a deceased wife's sister to be incestuous, and wedlock thus contracted to be null and void; and he severely punished a clergyman who had presumed to infringe ecclesiastical law, by performing the ceremony privately, and without due notice. Indeed, on all occasions, he paid the highest regard to order, and enforced the discipline of the Church in a manner which no Prelate since has even attempted. The ancient Church Courts were still in existence in the island, and were three in number; the most important, and that in which

the Bishop's personal presence was sometimes required, being the Consistory. These were extensively employed in the correction of offences, by suspension, deprivation, and excommunication, offenders being presented at stated times, according to the Canons, and receiving sentence, unless they were able to prove their innocence. The very first case which Wilson had to deal with was that of a clerical delinquent, who, after being duly admonished, was finally degraded. Unhappily there were many cases of incontinency among the Clergy, with all of which the Bishop dealt firmly and severely, making his rule felt as that of a father who chastened in order to amend. We need not particularise them further, only remarking, that the sentences pronounced on these offenders are not merely formal documents, but are conceived in a truly Christian and parental tone, expressing the utmost horror of such sin, especially in the case of Priests, and urging by all tender exhortations to submission and repentance. Delinquents among the laity were treated in a similar severely affectionate manner; penance was exacted from them,—often with the happiest result; and some flagrant sinners who despised mercy suffered the extreme penalty of excommunication. On the question of the observance of Sunday the Bishop had very pronounced opinions. He drew up a formal admonition against going out herring-fishing on that day; and in the records of the isle we constantly meet with penalties inflicted for breaking the holy rest by fishing, “fiddling,” tippling, working, &c. Sometimes a censure is inflicted for labouring on holy days, as Whitsun Monday, which is singular for many reasons, and not least for this, as it shows that Wilson's own sentiments grew stricter as he grew older, he having himself, on his return with his newly-married wife from England set sail in Holy Week, and landed in the isle on Good Friday. The prohibition of Sunday fishing brought him into collision with the Governor, who seems to have sanctioned it, and took the injunction as levelled against himself. This was, perhaps, the beginning of those troubles, political and personal, from which in after years he suffered so many annoyances and impediments. Hitherto his episcopate had been peaceful: His acts of discipline met with submission, his authority was unquestioned. In constant preaching, in visitation, in diligent prayer, in close attention to business, and in such agricultural pursuits as his time allowed, he exercised the ecclesiastical spirit, and maintained body and soul in a vigorous and healthy condition. Foremost in every good work he promoted the building and repairing of churches, though with little regard to beauty of effect, or correctness of architecture; he founded parochial and clerical libraries upon Dr. Bray's plan; he was one of the earliest wellwishers of the infant Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; he threw himself heartily into the work of the kindred Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and laboured long to establish a mission college in his diocese. His

conduct to the candidates for ordination was truly parental. For a year before their entrance on the ministry he received them into his house, watching over their conduct, superintending their studies, and directing their pursuits. He had long planned a Manx Catechism, preparatory to a translation of the Scriptures into that language. It was finished and printed in 1707, and formed the basis of the better known "Instruction for the Indians." The use of this was enforced by law at the time of public catechising on Sunday afternoons, copies being sent at his expense to all the Clergy of the diocese. Besides these labours which more especially appertained to his office, he effected a great reform in the tenure of landed property, disputes about which, as a baron of the isle, and first member of the Governor's council, he often had occasion to decide or to hear. His medical knowledge, too, was eminently useful in a place which had no physician resident in it; and even when duly licensed mediciners settled there, he still attended the poor, and distributed medicine and advice to the suffering.

But stormy times were at hand. Wilson's old friend and patron died in 1702, (his son's decease having taken place two years previously,) and was succeeded by his brother James, tenth Earl. This personage, a rude sailor, possessed of few brains and overweening self-importance, though at first he agreed with all the Bishop's reforms both in the settlement of tenures and in Church discipline, yet afterwards was the source of infinite trouble and annoyance, owing to his interfering and inconsistent conduct. The Canons by which the Manx Church was governed were partly those common to (though in many details superseded by Parliamentary enactments in) the English Church, and partly peculiar to the island. They had continued in force for some centuries; and if some of their details are repugnant to modern notions, and partake of the barbarism of the times when they were promulgated, yet they appear to have been carried out without opposition, whenever an Ordinary was found of sufficient vigour to put them in motion. In order to simplify the existing law, and to provide means for enforcing the whole system of the reformed English Church in its integrity, Wilson drew up his famous Ecclesiastical Constitutions. These formed a code of laws which is remarkable as expecting the aid of the civil power to enforce several of its decisions, and which, as Cruttwell observes, "virtually supersedes the Preface to the Communion Service." The Governor and Council willingly ratified the Constitutions; and thus for the first and only time since the Reformation a whole diocese was pledged, *and able* to put in practice, the entire law of the Anglican Church, and to carry out all matters of spiritual discipline with a high hand. For some time things went on smoothly; but on a change in the government of the isle, Mawdesley, the Bishop's staunch supporter, being superseded by Horne, a determined enemy of the spiritual power,

difficulties soon began to occur. There were several causes of disagreement. One vexed question was, whether the retainers of the Lord of the island were legally exempt from ecclesiastical penalties; a second was the abuse of the liberty of appeal to the civil government against the decisions of the Church courts; a third matter, which more immediately affected the pecuniary interests of Lord Derby, was concerning the right of the Bishop to mitigate the fines laid on offenders by the spiritual courts. These were all levied *in usum domini*, and could ill be spared in the shrunken state of the Earl's finances, taken in connection with the small results hitherto obtained by the Act of Settlement, which had failed to produce the fruits expected from it, and whose failure was attributed to the Bishop, as avowedly the author of the bargain. The penalties inflicted by the Bishop's courts were certainly what we should consider severe and intolerable. Flagrant cases of incontinency were punished with imprisonment, public penance in all the churches of the island, standing at the market cross with a placard on the breast, being dragged at the stern of a boat across the harbour, and excommunication for a longer or shorter term, according to the impression made upon the offenders, and the tokens of penitence which they showed. The Bishop always, if it was in his power, saw and conferred with the penitent; and, though he consistently enforced the discipline of the Church, yet he showed plainly that it was done from no mere priestly assumption, but to win the sinner to better things, and to deter others from committing similar transgressions.

But an organized opposition to the discipline was even now being prepared. There are never wanting persons who hate all strictness, and kick against any restraint upon the exercise of their "pleasures," as they term them. Severe laws against unchastity, drunkenness, slander, swearing, &c., found too many victims in a community wherein the two former vices seem to have lost their heinousness in men's eyes. We have mentioned the offence taken by the Governor at the prohibition of Sunday fishing. He was not long before he showed the Bishop that he was willing, whenever opportunity occurred, to do him an injury in return. The imputation of Jacobitism, in spite of his published reasons for taking the oath of abjuration, and his constant advice to the clergy of his diocese to support heartily and faithfully the existing government, was first set on foot by Governor Horne, and has gained more or less credit even till the present day. That there was not a shadow of reason for such a suspicion is apparent to every one who knows Wilson's straightforward honesty and thorough purity of motive. Matters, however, were brought to a crisis between the civil and spiritual power by the case of Mary Henricks. She was an obstinate offender; and having in vain tried all milder measures for her reformation, the Bishop was constrained to excom-

municate her. This sentence carried with it certain temporal consequences, viz., the forfeiture of property, and imprisonment or penal servitude. The woman appealed to the Governor to be allowed to lay her cause before the Earl of Derby, and Horne immediately accepted the appeal, and forwarded it to the Lord. This nobleman, already disaffected to the Bishop, and having now at his side none of those whom Wilson had formerly known at Knowsley, assumed the supremacy in this purely spiritual cause, and summoned the Bishop to London. To this summons Wilson responded neither personally nor by his proctor, and the case remained for some months in abeyance. Meantime his opponents endeavoured to strike him a side blow, by accusing two of his most trusted clergy of Romanism. The charge was made in general, vague terms, and respected chiefly the doctrines of Baptism, Confession, and Absolution; reminding one irresistibly of proceedings which we can all remember in our own Church courts. The Bishop immediately cited the two accused to answer the Governor's accusation. One of them, Mr. Ross, who had stated at a dinner-table that he had rather a Popish Priest baptized his child than a Presbyterian minister, made an elaborate defence, explaining that his reason for making this statement was, that he believed that a lawful minister was a necessity to the Sacrament of Baptism, and that he held the validity of Rome's orders, and denied those of the Presbyterians'. He argued also very reasonably that the fact of holding the same doctrines as Roman Catholics on such points as the Incarnation, Episcopacy, &c., did not prove that a person was well affected to the distinctive tenets of Romanism, but only that Romanism was so far in agreement with Catholic teaching. The other defendant, Mr. Macon, had a still easier task, having only to quote the words of his sermon to show the utter groundlessness of the charge. He had simply urged people to come to service before the Confession and Absolution, which, as he affirmed, "sanctified their persons," saying not a word respecting private confession, but confining his remarks to the public forms of Morning and Evening Prayer. The Bishop could do no less than give the following verdict: "We do declare that there is no reason, to us appearing or known, to charge them with Popery, or even with being Popishly affected." (P. 387.) In September, 1718, the opposition between the civil and spiritual powers became notorious by an act of Lord Derby and the Governor, who had it publicly proclaimed that Mary Henricks should be protected from further molestation, and should be absolved from excommunication. The Bishop still remaining passive, the Governor called upon him to show cause why he had not complied with the Earl's order. To this he replied, that there lay no appeal in the case. Thereupon, by Lord Derby's command, the Bishop was fined £10, with the threat of imprisonment if it was not paid. In vain he remonstrated with the Go-

vernor against this illegal proceeding, for which ancient precedent was not even pretended. The Governor had only one answer, that he had the verbal order of the Lord of the Isle, "who is also Metropolitan and Chief of the Holy Church of this Island,"—a preposterous assumption, which drove Wilson to seek redress in England. The Earl, to whom he first applied, was compelled to remit the fine, though he would not censure the arbitrary proceedings of his officers, or reverse their orders, till Wilson had appealed to the Lords Justices, from whose interference he obtained the satisfaction he demanded. The sentence on Mary Henricks was republished, and thus far the spirituality had gained the victory, and the public opinion of the isle went with the Clergy.

But the enemies of Church discipline were not thus to be silenced. The governor, who had often connived at the escape of convicted persons, now openly patronised them, and refused the aid of the civil power to carry out the ecclesiastical censures. In this opposition and heterodoxy, he was assisted by the Archdeacon, one Horrobin, a creature of Lord Derby's, with whom the appointment lay. And thus supported, he proceeded to act in the most violent and illegal manner. One of the Bishop's most trusted clergymen, was fined and imprisoned for not reading in his church a brief sent round by the governor without any authority from the Diocesan. Wilson himself was summoned before the Council, to answer for his mode of proceeding in his own courts, for calling Convocation at his own pleasure, and for treating the Lord's retainers as amenable to spiritual discipline. The latter charge referred especially to Archdeacon Horrobin, the governor's chaplain, who had been censured for unwarrantably withholding Communion from a parishioner who had offended him, and to Mrs. Horne, the governor's wife, who had in the same case incurred censure for defamation of character.

"We may notice," says Mr. Keble, "by the way, that two at least of the points now mooted between the spiritual and temporal courts, were in substance the same (though on so minute a scale) with some of those which had divided whole nations and Churches—not to say the whole of Christendom—in the Middle Ages. The Lord's claim to have his household exempt from spiritual discipline corresponds with Henry the Second's quarrel against Becket for presuming to excommunicate the King's tenants. And the Bishop's summoning his Synod at will was the prerogative of which the other Henry in the sixteenth century showed himself so jealous, and which he so effectually extinguished. Thus, as in so many other points, the annals of this small Island of Man prove to be a sort of miniature reflection of far more important histories."—P. 465.

The Bishop and his Vicars-general were of course condemned, in spite of their appeal to the two Deemsters and the twenty-four Keys of the Island, but nothing more was done for a short time;

only a Mr. Stevenson, who had assisted the Bishop in suppressing a blasphemous book, entitled "The Independent Whig," industriously circulated by Lord Derby and his dependants, was on some frivolous plea imprisoned and rigorously treated; and others, offenders against the laws of the Church, were encouraged to resist episcopal authority, and were even set at liberty when lawfully confined. The Archdeacon continuing obdurate under his censure, and proceeding to fresh offences in defiance of all discipline, was at length suspended *ab officio et beneficio*. This enraged the governor beyond measure. The Bishop was peremptorily ordered to cancel his sentence, which he refused to do. Then as a piece of petty spite, the Bishop's own Chapel at Castletown was closed by the governor's command, and Wilson and his officials were fined, the former £50, and the latter £20 each. These fines not being paid, on S. Peter's Day, as he notes, referring especially to the epistle for the festival, the good prelate and his vicars "were carried to prison by two soldiers for not paying the fine most arbitrarily imposed upon them." It is interesting to remark that this was the anniversary of his ordination. The event is entered in his catalogue of "Special Favours," thus: "I had the honour of being imprisoned for the faithful discharge of my duty." The feeling of the Island at this unheard of proceeding, was indignation and grief. The people assembled tumultuously in the towns, and were with difficulty withheld from laying violent hands on the governor, and pulling down his house. Nothing but the earnest exhortations of Wilson himself, who was permitted to address them from the window, or from the prison walls, restrained the passions of the populace. The clergy were comforted by a Pastoral issued on the third day of his imprisonment, in which he urged them to continue quietly to fulfil their several duties, taking due care of discipline and making presentments as usual, and to offer up daily prayer for him and his companions in trouble. And surely these had need of Divine support to enable them to endure with patience the "unexampled severity" to which they were subject, being, as Stowell tells us, closely confined and treated like felons, the jailors strictly charged to treat them with every mark of contumely, and admit no person within the walls of their prison, to see or converse with them.

From the Earl of Derby, to whom he had reported the proceedings of his subordinate, Wilson received only vulgar abuse and added insult. But he had now appealed to the King in Privy Council. And though impediments were put in his way by the Lord of the Island, and he was strictly debarred from all intercourse with his advisers even by letter, the appeal was favourably received, and carried to a successful issue; the Bishop and his friends were discharged from prison on bail, and returned to their homes after a confinement of nine weeks' duration. The day of release was observed as a general holiday; and whether the sympathy for their chief pastor's sufferings was due to attachment to his person, re-

spect for the Church, or the growing opposition to the encroachments of Lord Derby and his officers, the people were in a fervour of delight, and their congratulations were hearty and universal. But the prisoners had not emerged scatheless from their rigorous confinement. The health of all had suffered severely, and Wilson, now in his sixtieth year, lost for ever the free use of his right hand.

Into the various petty annoyances contrived by the malice of the governor and his associates, we have no space to enter; nor can we detail the various steps by which the Privy Council finally arrived at a favourable sentence in the Bishop's case, deciding that the appeal from the Spiritual Courts lay to the Archbishop of York, and that the Lord of the Isle had no jurisdiction in such questions. The only portion of the decision adverse to Wilson was the refusal to allow him the costs; but even this was softened by the offer of the Bishopric of Exeter, at that time vacant, to reimburse him the heavy expenses to which he had been put. True to his principles, Wilson declined the dignity, and the King promised to defray the costs from his privy purse, but neglected or forgot to do so. A private subscription among the prelate's friends effected that which royal generosity failed to supply.

Horne resigned, or was deprived of the governorship at the same time that Wilson returned triumphant from London, and was succeeded by Floyd, who seemed inclined to walk in his predecessor's steps, by showing himself a patron of criminous persons. One of them whose cause he espoused threatened the Bishop with assassination if he interfered further with him. Another, whom Floyd had made Captain of Douglas Fort, in order to shield him from episcopal censure, upon being excommunicated, applied personally to Lord Derby in England, who remitted his forfeitures, and took upon himself to "absolve" him from the sentence of his ecclesiastical superiors. It is most remarkable that this reckless, godless man, after gaining his wishes, and defying his Bishop for many months, was brought, by God's grace, to acknowledge his faults, and to sue humbly and sincerely for pardon and absolution at Wilson's own hands. "No penitent," says Mr. Keble, "could ever be more welcome to his absolver."

We must hasten to a conclusion of Wilson's history that we may say a few words respecting his character and writings, and the permanent effects of his episcopate. As his departure drew near, his tone, his look, his words, all spoke of heaven. His prayers increased in frequency and in fervour: at midnight his voice was heard rising in joyful orisons: his whisperings were of thanksgiving and song. Once, while a young friend was reading to him from the Greek Testament, he cried out, looking steadfastly upon some tall trees which stood before his library window, "Don't you see them? Don't you see them?" "See what, my Lord?" the reader asked, in great surprise. "The angels," answered the Bishop, "ascending and descending among the branches of those

trees." Mr. Stowell, who relates this anecdote, calls the vision the effect of an attack of delirium. The present biographer, with a deeper sense of the realities of the inner world, observes,—

"All who are much conversant with deathbeds must have now and then witnessed something like what then occurred—words, looks, and gestures, which made them bow the knees of their heart as at a true sign from heaven. And at such times what the dying Christian declared himself to see and hear, how could they possibly deny that it might be real?"—P. 959.

After this, his life was prolonged till March 7, 1755, when he peacefully expired in the 93rd year of his age, and the 58th of his consecration, dying with holy words in his mouth, uttering verses of the Psalms and the beloved *Te Deum* with his latest breath :

"God granting him, as to so many of His sainted servants in their last hours, that his incoherent unconscious utterances should bear witness that could not be feigned to the purity and devotion of his heart. Well for those whose habits of thought and speech are preparing them to follow him in this, should their reason too be clouded at the last."—Pp. 959, 960.

Thomas Wilson was eminently a man of prayer. In every trial, temptation, sorrow, joy, success, reverse, he fled to God. His *Sacra Privata* are the outpourings of a soul which ever lived in communion with her LORD. His history is written in his prayers. In secular or ecclesiastical matters alike every enterprise was commended to his FATHER'S guidance. Has he to speak to his patron on the subject of his extravagance, he prepares himself, like Nehemiah, by asking the Divine help; has he to administer medicine to a sick parishioner, he implores a blessing on the means he uses; in every circumstance of life, in every change that befalls him, in every department of his duties, in the correction of offenders, in the restoration of penitents, in Confirmation, in Ordination, in judicial proceedings, as Bishop, as landlord, as son, husband, father, friend, he is instant in prayer. When the season of the year was unpropitious, amid the howling of the tempest, and the drifting of the snow-storm; when difficulties and dangers beset his path; when success crowned his efforts; when his enemies were brought low; his intercessions and supplications rose on high. Every companion was named in his wide orisons; to be his foe was to secure a special mention. But he did not stop at prayer. He led no merely contemplative life. His was a thoroughly practical mind. Exact in details, painstaking even in little matters, with a clear head and a sound judgment, he entered into every portion of his work with the energetic zeal of a man of business, and yet with the simplicity and charity of a saint. Of his alms we have already spoken. Holding himself to be only the steward of the Church's patrimony, he had gradually increased in his benefactions till he arrived at the point of giving forty per cent. on his gross rental to religious pur-

poses. In his own barn he kept a chest for the poor, containing flour, which he daily delivered to such as applied to him for relief. All this he did without ever intermitting his hospitality. Every one who came was welcome to his table, where he received his guests with such good cheer as his own demesnes supplied, and seasoned the repast with that cheerful gravity and gentle courtesy, which became a chief pastor. Prompt in action, rigid in discipline, and possessed of very high administrative abilities, he governed his diocese with firmness and tenderness. No one was more strict in carrying out the letter of the law against notorious offenders; no one was more tender to the returning penitent. No good man could be near him without loving him. He had a wonderful power of evoking good feelings in men's hearts. The dissolute were ashamed of their lives when beneath his eye; the covetous grew generous, the indifferent devout, the careless strict; under his example and teaching. Without a particle of exaggeration or enthusiasm, without giving occasion to excitement or partisanship, he won his way into hearts the most opposite, and obtained an amount of reverence and affection which has fallen to few upholders of the Church's rights in later times. To this day his name is held in veneration in his island diocese, and aged peasants love to narrate the tales they have heard of the benevolence, and activity, and holiness of their beloved Bishop.

It may naturally be asked, then, seeing that Wilson's influence was so great during his lifetime, that he was enabled to put into execution the Church's laws in a diocese without a dissenter, and where the Church had the most favourable opportunity of development, whether he has left any very permanent effects of his long ministry. Of course, his writings are a precious heritage to the whole English Church, but it may well be doubted whether his personal work has impressed itself in any very important manner on the mind or the practice of Manx men. Is Man free from dissent now? Is the Church now the pattern of ritual, doctrinal, and disciplinary propriety? We fear not. The entire amalgamation of the island with the British Empire, and the consequent abolition of many insular peculiarities, deprived the Church there of much of her independence, and tended to reduce her to the usual Anglican type of post-reformation communities; but this will not altogether account for the entire extinction of the spirit, and the utter abeyance of the system, which a great and holy man, scarce a hundred years ago, gave all his powers, and all his exertions, to kindle and confirm. The truth is, the discipline enforced during Wilson's episcopate was defective in more than one respect. It was unfitted to modern times; it did not prevent the sin at which it was chiefly levelled; and it fell from its inherent inability to effect its own object.

A system which relied wholly on presentations and open penances, must necessarily be very partial and very uncertain in its operations. Notorious offenders were punished, and too often hard-

ened by their punishment. There were wanting that examination and guiding of the conscience, that sifting of the heart, and special direction, which can only be obtained at the feet of a skilled confessor. The sense of the community revolted against the white sheet, the taper, the placard, and the market-place. Hypocritical profession took the place of heart-broken penitence, while secret vice found no cure, as it dreaded to make itself known when its punishment must be open and public. The sinner who had some faint wish to reform feared to undergo the exposure and degradation necessary for his absolution, and too often learned to disregard that pardon which was offered only at so great a sacrifice. Doubtless a sincere penitent would have hailed the shame and disgrace as a part of the compensation due from him; but such penitents are comparatively rare, and most of the fallen need the tender treatment of private confession to win them to penance, and would only be deterred from recovery by harsh measures and public discipline. Take again the question of doctrinal orthodoxy which Bishop Wilson instilled and taught by his sermons, his conversation, his actions,—what has the *Main* Church to show for this? Has she been preserved from the errors which in the next age flourished so vigorously on the mainland? Alas, no. How little the truest, most eloquent teaching avail to impress even a single parish permanently, common experience testifies. The teacher removed, men's minds tend to reflect the views of the time or the neighbourhood in which they dwell, and the once highly lauded leader ceases to be followed to any appreciable extent. A constant succession of Catholic teaching is necessary; and where this is wanting, heresy and error will undoubtedly spring up. Humanly speaking, the great defence of orthodoxy is ritual. The Catholic faith will never maintain its position in any National Church, without its true expression and embodiment in Catholic ceremony. Now, as we have said, Wilson had no feeling for ritual. He desired to see a certain decency in the celebration of Divine worship; but there he stopped. His antiquarian taste never led him to take pains to improve the outward ceremonial of public offices. With a high appreciation of Eucharistic truth, it never seemed to have occurred to him, that magnificence and adornment of every kind befit the scene of such a mystery, and action that is in direct correspondence with the great High Priest Himself. So when the guiding mind had passed away, when the clear intellect with its grasp of high truth had ceased to direct, people and clergy had nothing but tradition, or memory, or books, to cling unto; they had nothing to appeal to them evidently at the very moment of worship, and the story of their Bishop's teaching died out; the libraries collected with so much trouble were neglected and dispersed; and Man became in belief and practice very much like the rest of England in the Georgian era, or found refuge in the quasi-earnestness of Wesleyanism.

We commend this history to the special observation of those in our own day who are disposed to look with a distrustful eye on modern developments, and who would have gladly stopped short at the "Tracts for the Times" and the "Plain Sermons."

Shall we then say that Thomas Wilson lived in vain? By no means. No good man's life was ever useless, though we may not be able to trace the hidden effects which it pleases God to produce through his means. If the local success of such an one seems to be confined to his own age, it is no proof that good of a different nature, and of a more extended operation, was not effected through his instrumentality. The personal holiness of such a man as Wilson is itself a lesson for all time. Those simply eloquent sermons, those devout breathings of the very spirit of prayer, those plain and straightforward instructions in Christian doctrine, are a treasure that any saint may well thank God that he was permitted to bequeath to the Church. Every faithful Churchman will echo the wish with which we conclude, that we now had many such in high places; that more of our sees were occupied by prelates possessed of the devotion, the honesty, the reverence, the orthodoxy of Thomas Wilson.

MORISON'S LIFE AND TIMES OF S. BERNARD.

The Life and Times of S. Bernard. By J. C. MORISON, M.A.,
Lincoln College. Oxford: Chapman and Hall.

(Continued from p. 227.)

WE resume our notice of this work, chiefly in connection with the "Times" in which S. Bernard lived. When we turn to this part of the subject treated of by our author, we are confronted with the same difficulties which during the whole existence of the mediæval Church press and importunately demand a solution. S. Bernard and his contemporary "Religious" lived in an atmosphere of miracle. There were the innumerable supernatural cures, prodigally effected on every side. Then, the very life itself which these devoted servants of God and the Church led, seemed to contemporary eyewitnesses to partake of a miraculous character, and to be no mere existence of the natural man. Then, lastly, these miracles were done, and this miraculous life was manifested in the midst indeed of a disobedient, but not only *not* sceptical, but a most credulous generation. The divisions, the schisms and the heresies, the triumphant violence of common—one cannot say social—life, contrasted with the wondrous works and the wondrous

lives of the Churchmen of this age, form a subject of contemplation the most perplexing, especially to those who consider miracles a testimony to the Church's fidelity. The powers of the world failed to intimidate the Church, the powers of the Church failed to overbear and subdue the world. Upon this topic Mr. Morison's observations, if not new, are yet forcibly expressed, the tone of his remarks not indicating much sympathy with the Church.

"Miracles, ghostly apparitions, Divine and demoniac interferences with sublunary affairs, were matters which a man of the twelfth century would less readily doubt of than of his own existence. To disbelieve such phenomena would have been considered good *prima facie* evidence of unsoundness of mind. The critical powers were then never for a moment exerted on an alleged case of miracle. If the miracle could, by any interpretation, be brought into some kind of connection with heaven or hell, with moral good or evil, it was assumed to be *natural*, not *unnatural* that miracles should occur. The modern definition of a miracle, namely, a violation of the laws of nature, would have by no means commanded S. Bernard's assent. He would have said, 'What are your laws of nature? I know them not. Miracle is the law of God.' The men of that time believed *that the air swarmed with angels; and if not with angels, then with devils. They believed that fearful and perpetual strife was being waged between the adverse hosts; that armies of good and evil spirits were for ever on the wing; that they encamped in invisible companies, to waylay and deceive, or counsel and succour the sons of men.* They believed they heard the laughter of the fiends borne on the night gusts of the moaning wind, and gradually retiring before the chorus-song of rejoicing angels, swelling up on the morning air. They believed that all evil thoughts were whispered in the ear by the emissaries of the old enemy of man's soul, and *that nothing but prayer, faith, and the help of the blessed saints would avail to avert or dispel them.* No expression of disgust or contempt is required now with reference to such a stage of human belief. The great majority of mankind have ever held opinions similar to or identical with the above. The exception is to hold the reverse, and to substitute for miracle a reliance on law. Intrinsically, then, these groundless beliefs are nothing but silly tales with little merit of either variety or invention. But regarded historically, as stages in man's mental development, they assume quite a philosophic importance. Even as fossil bones and shells to a geologist become hieroglyphics significant of far off revolutions and convulsions of the planet, so to the historian the great but extinct modes of thought [yet just above these modes of thought are said to have been ever forthcoming!] which have appeared in the intellectual world, are really the most important events he has to record. When Peter of Cluny tells us that 'very often the devils disturb the monks during the hours allotted to sleep, in order that they may feel sleepy when they ought to be awake, and thus lose the advantage of holy vigils; that he had often heard such complaints from many, of whom some

had had their bed-coverings pulled off them while they slept, and carried to a great distance;¹ some, after a struggle, had succeeded in wresting their bed-clothes from the demons, while others, when in the act of satisfying the wants of nature, had seen the devils stand before them in a mocking, ridiculing attitude; we can regard the whole as an absurd fiction if we choose, and in this light it is uninteresting enough. But if we remember and reflect who the venerable Peter was—how wise he was, how good he was, and what a leader of thought he was in his day—then the fact that it was possible for such a man to hold such absurdities as literally true, assumes a different aspect. The minds of men in the twelfth century were in some sort the reverse of ours. What we think or well know to be possible and feasible, men of the middle ages would have regarded as the idlest dreaming. What we know to be simply nonsense, they looked on as a matter of indisputable truth. They were far removed from being ‘ministers and interpreters of nature.’ They did not worship the powers of nature as their pagan ancestors did, but they had fully the same belief in the capriciousness of their [?] exercise. They had the same anchorless insecurity as to what the invisible world would next do to and in, the visible world. The men they saw, the trees, the houses, the green earth, the forest were alternately possessed and quarrelled over by the unseen powers of good and evil. And poor, feeble man, had to pick his way in the midst of them; *on either side of his path, at all hours of sleeping or waking, his mind and his heart were the desired prize of the one or the other. The deliberately wicked man was given over for the time, in full property to the fiend. The good, the deeply holy man, was surrounded by choirs of angels, and the devils were supposed almost to howl at his approach. He was changed, he was another creature to their [? whose] believing eyes; he was in direct correspondence with God. The breath of the Divine love had robed him in beauty.* Could there be any difficulty in thinking that such a one—one on whom the smile of the Eternal was supposed to rest; one whose thoughts moved, like the angels in Jacob’s dream, to and fro between earth and heaven; one whose future glory in the kingdom of the just was well assured—would it have been possible to doubt that to such a one the form and things of this miserable, accursed earth would yield a swift obedience as of servants to their LORD? Could inert matter, which even the very devils were able to work upon, resist a holy man full of the Spirit of GOD? Must not the earthly give way to the heavenly? Must not CHRIST be the conqueror of Satan.”—Pp. 66—69.

We have given the above extract at length, because it furnishes an excellent specimen of Mr. Morison’s style—rich, and picturesque, and occasionally inaccurate; and of Mr. Morison’s *tone*.

¹ The reader will remember the curious case of the invisible visitant, who so successfully disturbed the nights of the Wesley family, and with equal success avoided discovery. We commend to Mr. Morison the interesting and reverent solution of the subject offered by Mr. Isaac Taylor, who regards as the cause of all these annoyances a spirit, as much and as involuntarily dislodged from his own sphere, as the solitary locust once found in a London dwelling-house, alive, but furnishing not the least hint as to how or whence it had made its way to these northern latitudes.

He does not enter into his subject, neither does he allow his subject to influence him ; but he is something more than cold. The italics in the preceding passage are ours. In criticising, as of course he was bound to do, the carnal conceptions prevalent in that age respecting the unseen world, our author was surely bound not to discredit the plain teaching of Holy Writ. Some of the sentences we have marked, in the meaning of the writer, contravene some of the plainest texts, and most unquestionable warnings of the HOLY GHOST. With us, as in the twelfth century, it is a matter of faith that the visible conflicts of vice and virtue on the surface of society are but the indices of invisible antagonisms, and conflicts between beings other than human ; and we cannot believe, so long as the words of S. Paul and S. John are believed, that even society will accept or settle down into that rank epicureanism which seems implied in this extract. Apart, however, from this view of the subject, Mr. Morison ably traces out the mode in which a belief in miracles spreads. How Bernard was affected by his own wonders we shall now see. He appears to have only acknowledged this power at the time of the second crusade, when he was in his fifty-sixth year. The earlier marvels attributed to him may safely be put aside.

“ From Poitiers he proceeded to Bordeaux, and performed several miracles. ‘ At Toulouse, in the Church of S. Saturninus, in which we were lodged, was a certain regular Canon named John. John had kept his bed for seven months, and was so reduced, that his death was expected daily. The Abbot heard him confess his sins, and listened to his intreaties to be restored to health. Bernard mentally prayed to GOD: ‘ Behold, O LORD, they seek for a sign, and our words avail nothing, unless they be confirmed with signs following.’ He then blessed him, and left the chamber, and so did we all. In that very time the sick man arose from his couch, and, running after Bernard, kissed his feet with a devotion which cannot be imagined by any one who did not see it. One of the Canons, meeting him, nearly fainted with fright, thinking he saw his ghost. John and the brethren then retired to the church, and sang a Te Deum.’

“ Indeed, immediately after this miracle, Bernard, we are told, became quite uneasy on the subject of his own extraordinary powers. He said: ‘ I can't think what these miracles mean, or why GOD has thought fit to work them through such an one as I. I don't remember to have read, even in Scripture, of anything more wonderful. Signs and wonders have been wrought by holy men and deceivers: I feel conscious neither of holiness nor deceit. I know I have not those saintly merits which are illustrated by miracles. I trust, however, that I do not belong to the number of those who do wonderful things in the Name of GOD, and yet are unknown of the LORD.’ At last he thought that he had hit upon an explanation: it was this—that GOD in these cases has regard, not to the sanctity of one, but to the salvation of many. Miracles are not wrought for the good of

him through whom they are wrought, but for the good of those who see them or hear of them. They are not meant to show the worker of them as more holy than others, but to stimulate others to a more active love of holiness. 'These miracles, therefore, have nothing to do with me; for I know that they are owing rather to the extent of my fame, than to my excellency of life. They are not meant to honour me, but to admonish others.' Godfrey, who informs us of these difficulties of his master, considers that such a view of them [? difficulties, or miracles] is scarcely less miraculous than the miracles themselves."—P. 462.

And may we not reverently add, that if we are to call the helps and healings ministered by S. Bernard, through prayer, by the name of miracles, that it is more easy to believe that they were wrought, than to believe that the Abbot of Clairvaux was deceived and deceiving.

It remains for us to notice, and we must do it as briefly as possible, the political and ecclesiastical labours of S. Bernard, and the circumstances attending his departure from this life.

There might be a Pope at Rome, a Supreme Governor in the Western Church, but Bernard was the Pope of Europe: indeed, in a communication to the Bishop of Rome, he alludes to the current observation, that he, and not his Holiness, was the real successor of S. Peter. His merciful mediation on behalf of the innocent Humbert, whereby he saved Theobald from the peril of that more sudden and final disinheriting which God can inflict, and which he warned Theobald he would incur, shows at once the practical piety of Bernard, and "the tradition of a divine morality and superior culture coming into conflict with, and strong enough to withstand, a rigorous barbarism." (P. 80.) Mr. Morison again says with great truth, "It is as demonstrable as anything historical can be, that the aspiring and noble characters of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries found the Church, not a hindrance, but a help; that the good and true generally were welcomed and protected in it; that, in ages of cruelty, violence, and injustice, men turned to their 'mother,' as they were glad to call her, in loving hope mostly fulfilled, of justice, mercy, and forgiveness." (P. 129.) We have a further proof of Bernard's fearless vindication of right in his remonstrance with Louis VI., which he accompanied with a smart rebuke to Pope Honorius.

Then, among the political services of Bernard must be reckoned, if not the conception, the organization,¹ of that great order of knights who were called into existence by the Council of Troyes: the Guardians of the High-ways, the templars, who "were to keep the roads and passes free of robbers and assailants, and to watch over the safety of the pilgrims as much as they could." The year

¹ Mr. Morison thinks this is conceding too much to S. Bernard.

1129 witnessed the formation of the illustrious order of the white-mantled monks of S. Augustine, which, virtually suppressed after an existence of two centuries, is by many supposed to survive to this day in Paris.¹ If the pretensions of the Masonic body to represent the Knights Templars were well founded, the whole subject would be invested with a special interest, as connected with the great Abbot of Clairvaux. The suppression, and indeed one may say the massacre, of the order forms one of the great crimes of Europe; a crime in its own generation presenting, in some respects, even more startling and offensive features than the partition of Poland, or the confiscation of the Papal temporalities.

Fraught with more immediate consequences, and those of unmitigated misfortune, was the preaching of the Second Crusade, undertaken by S. Bernard, not, indeed, unwillingly, but not of his own first thought. Eugenius III. delegated to Bernard, as his own spiritual father, this responsible undertaking, in which Louis VII. had already embarked all his thoughts and aims. "The spiritual mind of Europe spoke through S. Bernard." His impetuous and fearless rhetoric swept away all the hesitations of Conrad III., and at the suggestion of Bernard the regency of France was entrusted to the holy Abbot Suger.

We cannot, of course, follow the well-told story of these Crusades, with its almost unvaried disasters. Its success is summed up in the one sentence: when the King and Emperor "met, they fell on each other's necks, and wept aloud." (P. 444.) Subsequently, when Louis endeavoured to retrieve the fortunes of the West, he was visited again by the same hapless fortune. When lying exhausted on the stony plain of Attalia, the sorry remains of the Western chivalry were betrayed by the Greeks to the Turks, who cut some thousands to pieces. But

"marvellous to relate, such was the scene of wretchedness presented by their camp, that even the fierce Moslem heart was touched with pity; they nursed the wounded, and fed the sick and starving. This mercy of the Turks gives one a feeling of awe. How unutterable must have been that woe which could pierce down to the humanity of a Turk, through his love of Islam, through his duty and delight in the slaughter of unbelievers! The Greeks made slaves of such of the pilgrims as were strong and serviceable. The contrast between the Christians and Pagans of the East was so great, that numbers of the pilgrims embraced the Mahommedan faith."—P. 453.

¹ A society under this name existed a few years ago, which professed to have in its keeping the original documents and records of the Templars, and to have been governed by an uninterrupted succession of Grand Masters since the martyrdom of the last, Jaques De Molay, March 18, 1314. The overthrow of the Templars has many points of resemblance to the destruction of our religious houses under Henry VIII.

Bernard was closing the grave of S. Malachi when the disastrous intelligence reached him, accompanied by loud murmurs of public discontent and irritation against himself. This event in his life illustrates, in a very clear light, the nobleness and the humility of Bernard's character. But a still sweeter illustration of his beautiful nature is found in his defence of the unhappy Jews at the time of the second crusade; that miserable race, for whom some of the gentlest men, like Peter of Cluny, could entertain no kinder wish than that they might be tortured in both worlds.

"That unfortunate race was now entering the darkest period in its long, dreary history of trial and sorrow. Before the Crusades, though often treated with cruelty, and always with contempt, the Jews of Western Europe had frequently known long intervals of comparative peace and happiness. The illustrious Charlemagne had openly shown himself their protector; and his son Louis imitated him in this respect. But simultaneously with the growth of the new ideas of fighting and slaughtering the infidels abroad, hatred was developed against the Jews at home. They were miscreants, as bad, or worse, than the Saracens; they were as rich, and far easier to kill—all excellent reasons for slaying them. At the commencement of the first Crusade, they were so fiercely persecuted, that they stabbed their own children, while their women jumped into the river. [What river?] And now, at the preaching of this second Crusade, the same tragedies seemed about to be repeated. A monk named Rodolph travelled through the towns on the banks of the Rhine, and by the most stimulating harangues inflamed the people to the highest pitch against the Jews. The massacres soon followed. Rodolph, emboldened and delighted by his success, waxed ever more violent. The Jews of those parts were like to be exterminated. Presently these events reached Bernard's knowledge. His soul at once blazed into one flame of divine wrath, as usually happened with him when he witnessed anything which he considered deeply unjust or wicked. He despatched messengers with letters to the various communities among whom Rodolph was preaching. He argued and demonstrated from Holy Writ that the Jews were not doomed to be slain for their crimes, but to be dispersed. To the Archbishop of Mayence he wrote a most impassioned letter, in condemnation of Rodolph. In it occur some golden sentences, which, if they alone, of all he said and wrote, descended to us, would proclaim Bernard a great man. 'Does not the Church,' he inquires, 'triumph more fully over the Jews by convincing or converting them from day to day, than if she, once and for ever, were to slay them all with the edge of the sword? Is that prayer of the Church appointed in vain which is offered up for the perfidious Jews, from the rising up of the sun unto the going down of the same, praying that the LORD GOD will take away the veil from their hearts, that they may be lifted up from their darkness to the light of truth? For if the Church did not hope that those which doubt will one day believe, it would be vain and superfluous to pray for them; but, on the contrary, she

piously believes that the LORD is gracious towards him who returns good for evil, and love for hatred. Is it not written, 'See that thou slay them not?' and again, 'When the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, then shall Israel be saved?' Thy doctrine, O Rodolph, is not of thee, but of thy father who sent thee. Nevertheless, it suffices thee if thou art like unto thy master, for he was a murderer from the beginning; he is a liar, and the father of it."¹—Pp. 425, 426.

This service alone to the cause of humanity and the Church ought to have entitled Bernard to the gratitude of mankind. Let us briefly review his direct services to the Church. The great sceptical historian, "whose humanity never slumbers save when virgins are ravished or Christians persecuted," in a few sentences, as characteristic as any he ever wrote, thus speaks:—

"A philosophic age has abolished, with too liberal and indiscriminate disdain, the honours of these spiritual heroes. The meanest among them were distinguished by some energies of the mind; they were at least superior to their votaries and disciples; and in the race of superstition they attained the prize for which such numbers contended. In speech, in writing, in action, Bernard stood high above his rivals and contemporaries; his compositions are not devoid of wit and eloquence, and he seems to have preserved as much reason and humanity as may be reconciled with the character of a saint. In a secular life he would have shared the seventh part of a private inheritance; by a vow of poverty and penance, by closing his eyes against the visible world,² by the refusal of all ecclesiastical dignities, the Abbot of Clairvaux became the oracle of Europe, and the founder of one hundred and sixty convents," &c.

And so on, in many more sentences of rhetorical hate and anti-theetical malevolence. The offences of Mahomet are summed up in two brief and partial sentences.

The labours of Bernard on behalf of the Church were directed to heal the schisms and overcome the heresies which disturbed and agitated the Churches of the Roman obedience two centuries before the existence of a separated Protestantism.

1. The first important matter which called for the mediation of Bernard was the succession in the Papacy on the death of that Honorius—second of that name—whom, as we saw above, Bernard had ventured publicly to rebuke. On his decease, a schism ensued.

¹ A Jewish contemporary, describing the extreme violence of the persecution, gratefully says: "Had not the tender mercy of the LORD sent that priest (Bernard), none would have survived." It was the most cruel persecution save that of Hadrian, says Gibbon, cap. 59; who, in his coarse and vulgar bigotry, accounts for the side taken by S. Bernard—"The contrary doctrine was preached by a rival monk."

² Gibbon (cap. 69), in a note, quotes the apocryphal story of Bernard having passed without observing the Lake of Geneva; a myth duly discredited by Mr. Morison, and wholly irreconcilable with that passionate love of nature so abundantly attributed to him by his contemporaries, and claimed by himself.

Anacletus, grandson of a converted Jew,¹ an ex-monk of Cluny, was supported by the suffrages of Rome itself, and what may be called the Radical party abroad, including England, at first; while Innocent II. was upheld by the strict Conservatives. Innocent, wisely escaping from Rome, committed himself to the charities of France, and early obtained a great testimonial to his own rights in his reception at Cluny. Louis VI. convened the Synod of Etampes to decide for him whom he should regard as Pope. Bernard was specially invited by the King and Bishops to preside; and not only won them all to the cause of Innocent, but—a much more arduous task—he conciliated to the same cause the politic Henry the Norman, and the Anglican Prelates. From France he hastened to the Emperor; and although Lotharius was ready to refuse his adhesion until certain rights were conceded, the persuasive eloquence of Bernard vanquished him; as afterwards it vanquished Milan, and Aquitaine, and Sicily.² The cause of that Anacletus, whom he called the Antichrist, declined; and at length a Divine calm was restored to the agitated Church. Anacletus dying, Innocent reaped at last the fruit of all the labours of the saintly friend he was so soon to treat with such illustrious ingratitude.

No less remarkable was Bernard's success in deposing the irregularly elected Bishop of Langres. In this case, with little, if any, right on his side, he gained over to his own views, from a most antagonistic attitude, the Pope, the Cardinals, the Bishops, the Archbishop of Lyons, and Peter the Venerable. The Cluniac monk was deposed, and the Abbot of Clairvaux succeeded in replacing him by a kinsman of his own. The story reminds us of a well-known incident in the life of our own Bentley. If Bernard's judgment was only warped here, unconsciously, he was actually and deliberately in the wrong in the case of Theobald; nor can it be any extenuation of his duplicity that it was approved and adopted by the Pope. Was not he himself Pope of the Popes?³ Truth bids us note, but reverence requires us at once to hide, the one blemish, or something more than blemish, in the life of S. Bernard. But the services we have named to the cause of society, to the Church at large, to the Church lying round his own home, do they not outweigh all the successes, do they not outshine all the shadowy glories of the Crusades?

2. But there were higher works of peace, requiring the guidance and skilful workmanlike handling of S. Bernard. The same blessing of the HOLY GHOST, which so marvellously prospered the efforts of Bernard for the reconciliation of the Church, attended on all his endeavours to check the spread of heresy within the Church.

¹ Gibbon, cap. 69.

² Roger agreed to recognize Anacletus as true Pope, if he in return would acknowledge him King of Italy. Is this historical fact a prophecy?

³ P. 394.

It is indeed "in contempt of question" that he was, as judged by the modern Romish standard, himself a heretic. An Abbot who, at this time, would dare to rebuke, exhort, confute, and expose a Bishop of Rome, would be overtaken by a speedy and memorable chastisement. The only courtly language addressed to the pontifical ear by the great Abbot, tells him, not what he is, but what he ought to be. The plain, stern, but ever gentle recluse,—for Bernard was a gentleman in the true sense of the phrase,—knew nothing of (and we feel assured, if he had known, he would have loathed) the elaborate Papiculture of modern days. If for once he forgets the tenderness due to the sinner while denouncing the sin; it is when he is cut to the quick by the contemplation of the rottenness of Rome.¹ What Bishop of Rome would venture to acknowledge himself, as did Eugenius III., an Abbot's disciple? or brook such sharp criticisms on the abuse of appeals?² If Bernard had cause to complain in that day, what would he not urge in this? Or, again, what modern Romanist would venture to address to his co-religionists such a letter as Bernard addressed to the Canons of the Church at Lyons on the unauthorized appointment of a festival of the Immaculate Conception.³ That dogma S. Bernard—like S. Thomas and S. Bonaventura—denied. Having denied the doctrine without any reserve—without specifying in what sense he did not deny it—without laying down the subtle *distingua* between active and passive conception—without hinting at that most curious physiological speculation, wholly unascertainable, yet on which the dogma wholly rests—Bernard (we must uncanonize him here) most naturally was seen in visions of the night enduring purgatory, and wearing that blemish on his breast which testified his heresy.⁴ While Bernard, by his example, prayers, and letters, never ceased to raise the character of his contemporaries, and exalt their notions of faith and piety, the leaders of his time in Church and State never failed to resort to him for succour in the conflicts to which they were called with the ever-growing heresies of the day.

Mr. Morison preserves the history of the two most remarkable incidents of this kind in the saint's life: the later may be despatched in a few words. From the beginning of the twelfth century a vigorous heresy was spreading throughout the south of France. The followers of Peter de Bruis and the monk Henry were propagating a disbelief in the Real Presence, Infant Baptism, and other Catholic verities. While these were denouncing doctrine, the or-

¹ The passage may be found in Gibbon, cap. 69, who with persistent malice adds, "Surely the dark portrait is not coloured by the pencil of Christian charity." And surely we do not need Petrarch to tell us that Bernard, though a saint, was a man, and a passionate one.

² Morison, p. 483.

³ Mr. Flower, with a slight inaccuracy, say, in his preface, that they *wished* a festival celebration, &c.

⁴ See note, Morison, p. 388.

thodox Arnold of Brescia was denouncing the hierarchy. But, worst of all, Gilbert, Bishop of Poitiers, was giving way to tritheistical speculations, and denying that the highest essence is God. A realist in philosophy, Gilbert was one of the most subtle and learned of the theologians of the age. His heresies, however, were brought before the notice of Eugenius III. by his own Archdeacon. The Pope, intending to visit France, summoned a Council at Paris, that he might examine himself the causes of complaint; and again he summoned another Council at Rheims, and Bernard was pressed to conduct the cause of the Catholic truth, which, however, did not triumph without an appeal to the Pope, who condemned Gilbert; and the Bishop of Poitiers submitted himself to the correction of the Pope. The discussion before the Council was very animated. "‘You also write down that Divinity is God,’ said Gilbert to Bernard. ‘Write it,’ replied Bernard, ‘with a pen of adamant, and with the point of a diamond; nay, grave it in the flinty rock, that the Divine essence, nature, form, duty, goodness, wisdom, virtue, power, magnitude, truly is God.’" (P. 465.)

It was the influence of the celebrated Abelard which had betrayed poor Bishop Gilbert into the heresies which he seems to have very readily and cheerfully retracted. Next to Bernard's own, the name of Abelard is the greatest in that age. But his genius and his popularity—and he possessed the one and acquired the other in a measure almost unexampled—left little, if any, after-fruit; and the one great philosophic teacher of the age failed to found a school, in the proper sense of the term. History presents him rather as the hero of romance—as such we would offer him to Mr. Kingsley or Dr. Stanley—than a servant of the Church. Half Pagan, half pious, in his intellectual complexion, uniting to an excessive animalism the keenest mental activity, he furnishes as striking an example as can be found of the perilousness of his position, who in the culture of the head neglects the education of the heart. Perhaps we cannot do him justice. If his literary remains do little to justify the great admiration entertained for him by his contemporaries, he has bequeathed to us the affecting moral of a sorrowful life and broken heart. There is a holy lesson written for the encouragement and strengthening of youth, and the scene is laid in a ruler's house in Egypt, and the time is three millenniums past. If the young and gifted, the passionate and ambitious, who are hopeful of a brave and fruitful career in life, will not lay it to heart, let them read the story of Abelard and the house of Fulbert; the infamous methodicalness of that deliberate seduction, when the teacher of theology sat down to corrupt and betray virgin innocence, and at the same time to destroy the ends and uses of his own life on earth.¹ But our attention is due to the consideration of his intercourse with

¹ His "genius drooped and withered under this storm of passion." Morison, p. 297.

Bernard. For more than twenty-five years the tragic story of Abelard was before the world; but only lately did Bernard know that Abelard was the propounder of heretical opinions. Abelard was now sixty-one years of age, and twelve years the senior of Bernard. Affecting to emancipate the human mind from its old forms of thought, Abelard would be soon regarded with distrust by Bernard. This *tone* of mind alarmed the Abbot—as Mr. Morison has well observed—more than any definite error resulting from it. Here is Abelard before his crime:—

“Paris was already the most renowned school in Europe. This crowd of learners was now startled by the appearance of a teacher among them, who, for power to kindle enthusiasm, and make men rejoice they were permitted to be his disciples, had not been equalled since the days of the Athenian sages. No pale pedant or emaciated bookworm was he. Noble by birth¹ and haughty in carriage, gifted with vast powers and fully conscious of them, singularly handsome, and enhancing this advantage by a costly and scrupulous attention to dress, Abelard taught, with vigorous, daring originality, almost the whole sum of human science then known, or cared for. He was admired, followed, waylaid, obstructed by passionate adherents, and by many who were not adherents. His success was complete. His rivals were silenced; he grew rich.”—P. 295.

With his first ecclesiastical censure Bernard would seem to have had nothing whatever to do. To condemn his work on the Trinity, a gathering “which they called a council, was got together at Soissons.” They at last prevailed upon the Legate to condemn the book without further inquiry. The narrative is condensed by Mr. Morison from Abelard’s history of his calamities:—

“On being called, I presented myself before the Council, and, without any discussion or examination, they compelled me to burn it with my own hand. And so it was burnt amid general silence. One of my adversaries, in an under tone, murmured, that he had found it asserted in that book that GOD the FATHER alone was Almighty. The Legate said he could hardly believe it; even in a child such error was incredible, seeing that the common faith holds and professes three ‘Almighties.’” Hereupon a certain Terricus, a professor in the schools, burst out laughing, and, quoting S. Athanasius, whispered, ‘And yet not three Almighties, but One Almighty.’ His Bishop reproved him for his rude behaviour, but Terricus boldly continued. Archbishop Rudolph, of Rheims, came to the rescue of the zealous but incautious Legate. ‘And now,’ he went on to say, ‘it were good if that brother,’ pointing to Abelard, ‘were to explain his faith before us all, so that it may be approved, condemned, or corrected, as may be necessary.’ When he arose to expound his faith in his own words, his judges said there was no necessity for anything be-

¹ He was the son of Berengarius, Lord of the Castle of Le Pallet, near Nantes, and Lucia, his wife.

yond his recitation of the Athanasian Creed, 'a thing which any boy could do.' To complete his humiliation by a practical sarcasm, they placed a copy of the Creed before him, hinting thereby that the document was doubtless new to him, and that he could not be expected to know it without. 'I read, amid sobs and sighs and tears, as well as I could; and then, like a convicted criminal, I was given over to the Abbot of S. Medard, to be kept in close custody at his monastery.'—P. 305.

From these troubles he found an escape under the kind patronage of Suger and Theobald, the friends of Bernard. From this fact, and the courteous visit of Bernard to the Paraclete, of which Heloise was abbess, and her conduct then, we conclude that the self-torturing Abelard had not just cause to attribute any part of his trouble to S. Bernard. They had already met more than once in the presence of Pope Innocent at Morigni. Abelard's own bitter and sarcastic and wholly unprovoked letter to Bernard leaves no doubt of the desires and feelings of the frustrated Dialectician.¹ But when the heretical notions implied, to say the least, in Abelard's "Introductio ad Theologiam," were brought before Bernard, another proof of the kindly disposition of Bernard to Abelard was furnished herein. Bernard made efforts towards a good understanding; and Abelard was so won by Bernard's modest and rational behaviour, that he promised a general correction of his erroneous views at Bernard's discretion.² But the conference led to no good result. Bernard discovered with horror how widespread were the tenets of Abelard. It is almost with a cry of anguish he confesses that Peter had both followers and admirers. Abelard was impatient, himself, for the trial of his faith. He demanded to be heard before the Assembly of Sens, and insisted on being confronted with his accuser. But Bernard declined the battle. "I refused because I was but a child, and he a man of war from his youth." But he yielded to persuasions, and armed himself for the duel, in entire trust and reliance upon God. On the second day of the Council

"Abelard entered, and walked up between the ranks of monks, priests, bishops, and warriors, on each side of him. His eye caught that of Gilbert de la Porree, and as he passed him, he whispered the significant line,

'Nam tua res agitur paries cum proximus ardet.'

"He moved on through the hostile crowd. He stopped in the centre of the building, and found himself opposite Bernard. In a pulpit which was in existence up to the time of the French Revolution, stood Bernard, holding before him the incriminated work of Abelard. He read, or caused to be read, the passages he had marked for reproof, explanation, or condemnation. But the lecture had

¹ We cannot find any letter of Bernard's in reply.

² Pp. 341, 342.

hardly begun, when to the speechless astonishment of all, Abelard rose up, said he refused to hear more, or answer any questions. He appealed to Rome, and at once left the assembly."—Pp. 854.

The cause of this extraordinary conduct may most likely be found in Abelard's opinion of the temper of the meeting. He must have seen that nothing was to be expected from it but condemnation. But Bernard would not be baulked. In a letter to Pope Innocent he elaborately exposes the worst of the sophistries of Abelard; and

"whatever may be thought of the tone of this tract, whatever may be thought of the exalted Bernard striking at the downfallen Abelard, there can be but one opinion as to the commanding powers which passed from action to speculation, from ruling men to refuting opinions, without pause or difficulty."—P. 359.

Abelard travelling towards Rome to prosecute his appeal, rested at Cluny, where he received a welcome from the Abbot Peter, a man "of an unutterably guileless and sympathetic heart." In his behalf, that he might be allowed to nurse his declining years at Cluny, Peter wrote to the Pope. There amid great bodily affliction he prepared to meet his end, and dressed his soul to meet the Bridegroom. The Saintly Ruler of that religious house records the childlike humbleness, the penitence, and tenderness of Abelard. He met Bernard, and the old animosities were removed in peace. In truth, old things had passed away from him, and the new returned upon him with unspeakable consolations. In Cluny the LORD found him and took him in great peace.

Bernard survived the reconciliation with Abelard eleven years. His next effort was to pacify the inhabitants of Metz. This occurred in the year before his dissolution, and was the last exercise of his marvellous skill as a peacemaker. Bodily infirmities were now gathering fast on him. As nature ebbed away from himself it ebbed away from his friends. One by one

"Like clouds that rake the mountain summits,
Or waves that own no curbing hand,
How fast did Brother follow Brother."

The first to precede him—as he himself expressed it—to the realms beyond the sun, was the true-hearted Suger. The year following, Count Theobald of Champagne, "Bernard's lifelong friend and benefactor," fell asleep. Yet another year, and Eugenius, the disciple of Bernard, left vacant the papal throne.

"Bernard had no wish to remain behind those beloved friends. When in accordance with his beautiful faith, he attributed a slight recovery to the prayers of his sorrowing monks, he said to them, 'Why do you thus detain a miserable man? you are the stronger, you prevail against me. Spare me, spare me, and let me depart.'

The unwearied activity of mind which had hitherto distinguished him, gradually faded away; the marvellous brain which had grasped and influenced more or less every question and event in Europe for a whole generation, fell by degrees into peaceful repose. Public affairs ceased to interest him: when his cousin, the Bishop of Langres, came to him about some business, he found he could not attract Bernard's attention. 'Marvel not,' said the expiring saint, 'I am already no longer of this world.' The weeping multitude of his friends, in the delirium of grief, implored him not to leave them, to have pity on them, and to stay with them. The last earthly struggle he ever knew had commenced in Bernard's soul. Things temporal and things eternal, his earthly and his heavenly home, the love of God and the love of man contended within him. But for a moment. Raising up his 'dovelike eyes,' he said he wished that God's will might be done.—It was, for he was dead."

And so that beautiful and loving heart had rest at last. And for the very sweetness of his memory our eyes are filled with tears.

STANLEY'S LECTURES ON THE JEWISH CHURCH.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part I., Abraham to Samuel. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christchurch. London: Murray, 1863.

THAT was a trite and commonplace remark, although expressed in his own peculiar fashion, to which the author of "Proverbial Philosophy" gave expression—

"There is no error so crooked, but it hath in it some lines of truth;
Nor any poison so deadly, that it serveth not some wholesome use."

This, or its converse, is, we think, peculiarly applicable to Dr. Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church. It seems an ungrateful act to speak harshly of a book which we have read with so much interest; but yet truth compels us to record our verdict, that, whatever are the wholesome uses it may serve, it is but *poison* after all. We call it poison, because the principles from which it starts, and the conclusion to which it tends, are all calculated to weaken the authority of Holy Scripture. The bare and open scepticism of Bishop Colenso is less attractive, and therefore less dangerous, than the eloquent and picturesque pages of Dr. Stanley. Bishop Colenso has been an injudicious friend to his cause; he has arrived at his conclusions too hastily, and stated them too abruptly. He has

therefore caused a revulsion towards Catholic Truth in the minds of some who were disposed to doubt, before they perceived the end to which their doubts were tending. If Dr. Stanley's book had preceded Bishop Colenso's, or Bishop Colenso's had been delayed for a while, the former would have prepared the public mind for the reception of the latter. As it is, the Bishop of Natal has been guilty of an indiscretion at which Dr. Stanley and his friends are justly indignant.

While there is no charm, except to those who have already lost their faith in the authority of Scripture, to be derived from Bishop Colenso's arithmetical calculations, Dr. Stanley's lectures will, for many reasons, be welcomed by some of the most devout students of Biblical literature; and therefore it must be a source of lasting regret that a book of such value should be mingled with so large a proportion of what we must deliberately reject as poisonous.

In order fully to realize the facts of Scripture, it is not only necessary to picture to our minds the persons who are grouped in the foreground, but we must fill up the scenery by which they are surrounded. Without this the picture is incomplete; but the Sacred Records leave this for the most part to be supplied by the imagination. To those for whom the Scriptures were first written, the scenes of the events recorded were so familiar, that it was needless to depart from the ordinary form of ancient writings, in which the features of nature were rarely depicted. To us, however, it is no small advantage that one, who has so diligently explored the Desert and the Holy Land, and is so richly gifted in the remarkable talent of word painting, should delineate for us, in fresh colour and clear outline, the habitations and manners of the Patriarchs of old. With this assistance we can better follow Abraham in his wanderings, and realize the daily lives of Isaac and of Jacob. This we believe to have been the honest intention of Dr. Stanley, and with this part of his performance we will find no fault. It is not with the paintings themselves, so much as with the showman, that our controversy lies. The scenery may be faultlessly true, and the figures correct in dress and feature; and yet the showman may give us an entirely false impression of their histories, when he discourses on the subjects of his paintings.

The first fault which we must find with Dr. Stanley respects the authorities on which his lectures are based. Holy Scripture, the Koran, and even heathen traditions are placed together, as if their authority were almost equal. The aim of the lecturer seems, not so much to give a true, as a picturesque sketch of the primeval Fathers of the Jewish Church. Nothing, therefore, comes amiss which can serve his purpose; and consequently, after all, the result is something like Dr. Arnold's History of the Roman Kings—a narrative prettily told, but on which he may afterwards turn round and say that it need not be historically true, any more than the legends of

King Arthur. When we find Dr. Stanley repeating stories from the Koran and the Talmud, for the purpose of filling in the detail of his pictures, he cannot complain if we doubt the sincerity of his purpose. In appearing to believe too much, he suggests the possibility that he believes too little; and therefore we repeat that we know of no book better calculated to prepare the public mind for the reception of Bishop Colenso's scepticism than the Lectures on the Jewish Church.

The authenticity of the Books of Moses is a fact which he manifestly disbelieves. The Pentateuch is probably called "the Books of Moses" because they are about Moses; but what the Book of Genesis contains concerning Moses is a thing respecting which we have yet to be informed! Before we can enter into controversy with Dr. Stanley respecting the authorship of these sacred writings, he must name some writer or writers to whom they may with greater probability be ascribed. In the meantime we shall continue to receive the unbroken tradition of the Jewish and the Christian Church, believing that, when the contrary cannot be proved, books must be ascribed to the authors whose names they bear. Dr. M'Caul has ably stated the internal evidence for the genuineness of the Pentateuch, resulting from the archaic form of the writings themselves, and the acquaintance of the writer with Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula; but the most convincing proof in their favour is the testimony borne to them, not only by mere man, but by our Blessed Lord Himself, Who distinctly quotes the *Book of Moses* (S. Mark xii. 26, S. Luke xvi. 29), and appeals to Moses as speaking of Himself (S. John v. 46). To assert that our Lord said that which was untrue, only in accommodation to the ignorance of the Jews, is a position scarcely worth refuting, as it will be at once rejected by every reverent mind.

"The free handling of the Scriptures in a becoming spirit" is a term which has now passed into a proverb. We are, however, somewhat astonished to find it applied to the prefaces in Dr. Pusey's Commentary on the Minor Prophets. If it is capable of application at all, Dr. Stanley well knows that the words must be made to mean something very different from that which they were at first intended to signify. To discover the circumstances under which prophecies were uttered, and to explain away the records of Scripture, are certainly two things so utterly dissimilar, that the same words in the same sense cannot possibly apply to them both; and therefore Dr. Stanley is guilty of the fallacy of introducing an ambiguous middle term. Still more is our surprise increased, when we find that the Septuagint translators possessed the high honour of being the first fathers of free handling. What this may mean we cannot say; but certainly the free handling of the LXX. must have been something very different from that of the Essayists and Reviewers. To explain away the facts of Scripture was surely no

part of their undertaking. Their utmost divergence from the original Hebrew is found in different forms of expression, the incorporation of glosses in their text, and in some difference of numbers. There are many ways of accounting for these variations without being driven to the supposition of free handling—a theory contradicted by the tradition of inspiration, which was believed from a very early date down to modern times. Neither did the Septuagint translators profess to be free handlers, nor were they believed to be such. If in the time of Origen the text of the Septuagint had become greatly corrupted, we may suppose that by this time it has travelled farther from the original. We must remember also that the translation was made before the introduction of points had fixed the sense of words in the original Hebrew which before were doubtful. It is moreover possible, as some critics have supposed, that the Septuagint was translated, not from the Hebrew, but from a Chaldee paraphrase, or else from the Samaritan text. All these may have been used; and even although the authority of Aristæus' letter may be doubtful, we must remember that these are the Scriptures which our Blessed Lord and His Apostles often quoted, and thus stamped with an authority which would be paramount, if we only had a text which was perfectly pure.

Dr. Stanley's Lectures cover the whole space of Jewish History from the call of Abraham to the death of Samuel, to which two more are added on the History of the Prophetical Order and the Nature of the Prophetical Teaching. For his description of the migration of Abraham and his manner of life, as illustrated by the habits of the wandering Bedouins of the present day, we feel thankful to Dr. Stanley; but there are several statements which, even thus early in the book, caution us to beware. The call of Abraham is treated as a natural rather than as a supernatural event, and the manner in which Abraham attained to the knowledge of God is derived, not from the Bible, but from the Koran. That Polytheism was the universal religion of the world in the days of Abraham is a fact which we doubt. The Patriarch's kindred may have worshipped other gods, and this may have been one reason why the Father of the Faithful was called to leave his country; but the histories of Balaam and Melchizedek cast the greater weight of probability on the belief that there were still to be found on the banks of the Euphrates and the Jordan some who had preserved the tradition of the True God which Noah had handed down to posterity. Dr. Stanley, however, following in the steps of Professor Max Müller, makes Abraham not only the inventor of Monotheism, but the author of the name Elohim. He has yet to prove, however, that the name Elohim, of frequent occurrence in the earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis, was not known before. Dr. Stanley's hypothesis throws discredit on the accuracy of the other

parts of the Book of Genesis, since we must suppose that the words of Noah (Gen. ix. 26) are not accurately recorded, and that our first parents did not use the name Elohim. (Gen. iii. 3.) That the two names, **JEHOVAH** and Elohim, could co-exist together, the one as a specific term and the other as generic, and that consequently they do not mark different ages, has been well shown by Dr. McCaul in his *Essay on the Pentateuch in Aids to Faith*. The lesson, moreover, which Dr. Stanley founds on the hypothesis of Professor Max Müller, appears to us still more open to objection. The use of a plural noun for the name of God, by the discoverer of Monotheism, is represented as an accommodation to the polytheism of the surrounding nations, instead of having reference to the doctrine of the TRINITY, which will naturally occur to our readers.

"Whatever," says Dr. Stanley, "the names of the Elohim worshipped by the numerous clans of his race, Abraham saw that all the Elohim were meant for GOD; and thus Elohim, comprehending by one name everything that ever was or ever could be called Divine, became the name by which the Monotheistic age was rightly inaugurated; a plural conceived and construed as a singular. From this point of view the Semetic name of the Deity, which at first sounds not only ungrammatical, but irrational, becomes perfectly clear and intelligible. *It is at once the proof that Monotheism rose on the ruins of a polytheistic faith, and that it absorbed and acknowledged the better tendencies of that faith.* In the true spirit of the later Apostle of the Gentiles, Abraham, his first predecessor and model, declared the God, 'whom they ignorantly worshipped,' to be the 'GOD that made the world and all things therein,' 'the LORD of Heaven and earth,' 'in whom we live, and move, and have our being.'"—P. 23.

The life of Abraham is treated as a standing rebuke to sacerdotalism, and even to the extermination of the Canaanites, to the accomplishment of which Joshua was specially inspired.

"Abraham," says Dr. Stanley, "is not an ecclesiastic, not an ascetic, not even a learned sage, but a chief; a shepherd, a warrior, full of all the affections and interests of family and of household, and wealth and power; and for this very reason the first true type of the religious man, the first representative of the whole Church of God."—P. 21.

If he was not an ecclesiastic, what meant the sacrificial rites he was continually performing, and why was Abimelech instructed to seek the intercession of Abraham because he was a Prophet?

When Dr. Stanley expresses a doubt whether Melchizedek paid tithes to Abraham, or Abraham to Melchizedek, he refers us to S. Jerome. With every respect for the revered name of this ancient Commentator, we still believe the statement of S. Paul, that Abraham gave tithes to Melchizedek and the argument he founds thereon, to be a satisfactory solution of any doubt which might be

entertained. (Heb. vii. 4.) This is one of the instances in which the words of the New Testament must be accepted as an infallible interpretation of doubtful expressions in the older Scriptures, for unless this be admitted, the New Testament is reduced to the level of any common book.

The treatment which the sacrifice of Isaac receives at Dr. Stanley's hands is perhaps the most painful part of his book. There was no direct command from God which bade Abraham offer up his son. Abraham only supposed it. It is regarded as an imitation of the human sacrifices which were common amongst the native races of Canaan; and even the temptation of the Patriarch is ascribed to the influence of the Evil One.

"That this temptation or trial, through whatever means it was suggested, should, in the sacred narrative, be ascribed to the overruling voice of God, is in exact accordance with the general tenor of the Hebrew Scriptures. A still more striking instance is contained in the history of David, where the same temptation, which in one book is ascribed to God is in another ascribed to Satan. 'The Lord moved David to say, Go, number Israel.' (2 Sam. xxiv. 1.) 'Satan provoked David to number Israel.' (1 Chron. xxi. 1.)"—P. 48, note.

Surely the cases are dissimilar. In David's case that was a sin to which the King was tempted, and God permitted the temptation, as He allowed Balaam to go with the messengers of Balak; but that to which Abraham was tempted is spoken of as an act of faith and obedience. In David's case self-love and the pride of empire were inducements to the sin, whilst in that of Abraham every natural feeling of a parent's heart revolted from the act which was to try his obedience. There is no suggestion in the sacred narrative of any other influence than simple obedience to the Divine command; but Dr. Stanley converts this deed of heroic resignation into an act of fanatic enthusiasm, a base yielding to Satanic temptation, and one of the most unnatural crimes of which a human being could be capable. According to Dr. Stanley's theory, the resignation of the will was indeed accepted; but consistently with this, the surrender of the will to any Satanic agency would be equally acceptable in the eyes of God.

The separation between Abraham and Lot is made to teach a moral lesson to the Christian Church. It is used as a Divine sanction of divisions in the Church, which ought to teach us to look on with complacency when the seamless robe of Christ is rent asunder, and the unity of His Church divided. Whatever comfort may be derived from this teaching, we are content to leave it to the rival parties in Dissenting congregations who separate themselves, and form new sects on account of trifles less important than the digging of a well.

The lecture which treats of Jacob and Esau is an example of the

manner in which Dr. Stanley deals with the narratives of Scripture. According to Bishop Colenso, they are not historically true, whilst the Professor of Ecclesiastical History considers them as historical and nothing more. The Divine intervention which secured the birthright to Jacob is altogether overlooked, and Jacob is treated as the counterpart of the crafty Jew of modern times, the Shylock of Venice, or the Isaac of York. The degradation of character, which is a part of God's righteous judgment on the people who rejected the SAVIOUR, never enters into Dr. Stanley's account. This we think is an artistic, as well as a theological mistake. In Mr. Holman Hunt's painting of "CHRIST amongst the Doctors," the portraits are taken from the Rabbis, whom the artist found at Jerusalem, and exquisite as the painting is, it produces a painfully mundane effect. The evil craft which is visible in the glance of the Doctors is an attribute, not of God's chosen people, but of the nation which is now condemned to wander on the face of the earth. Just as well might a painter depict the ancient senators of Rome, as Italians whom he might meet in the streets of Rome; and this is just what Dr. Stanley has done in drawing the portraiture of Jacob.

Of course regarded on the human side there is much in the conduct of Jacob which is inexplicable to us, and much that would be indefensible on any other supposition than the intervention of God Himself. The same difficulty will often occur as we follow on the course of Jewish history. Samuel's treatment of Agag cannot be defended on human principles of morality, but when God interposes, we must be content to restrain our judgment. We do not blame Dr. Stanley for considering the human element in Jacob's conduct, but for considering it exclusively. Bishop Wilson had before pointed out how Jacob's history teaches us a lesson against duplicity, showing how, even in his case, a retribution followed him all the days of his life, how he, who deceived his father, was deceived by Laban, and how he, who brought a kid to Isaac, was imposed on by his sons, when they showed him Joseph's coat dyed with the blood of a kid. All this is quite compatible with the course of Jacob's history being divinely appointed. The Supreme Lawgiver may dispense with His own laws; and whilst it may have pleased Him to bring about the blessing on Jacob, He may not have spared him from the penal consequences of fraud, in order that such an example might never be cited in extenuation of duplicity. However, even on the human side, it must be remembered that Esau willingly parted with his birthright, and that in what he did Jacob followed out the instructions of Rebecca, who took the responsibility on herself.

An explanation of the wrestling of Jacob is insidiously suggested in a note, where Dr. Wolff is introduced, as describing the religious services of the Dervishes, which resemble an actual wrestle, and

are conducted with such vehemence as actually to dislocate their joints. Unless this note is introduced with the intention of throwing discredit on the narrative which is contained in the text, we do not know what purpose it could possibly serve.

For the history of Moses Dr. Stanley does not find sufficient material in Holy Scripture, and therefore the outline of his early life is filled in with legends. We know of no method more likely to diminish reverence for Scripture than this mingling together of Scripture and legend. One must be exalted to the elevation of the other, or both will sink together to the same level. It is no excuse to say that this adds to the scenery of the picture, for such a tampering with history, however pardonable in an artist or a poet, is altogether unworthy of the Professor's position.

Moses, however, is a great man in Dr. Stanley's eyes, because his institutions left their impress on the national mind of the people; but although Divine interposition is not denied, he is treated throughout as a legislator and a politician.

"In the ancient language," says Dr. Stanley, "both of Jews and Christians, he is known as 'the great Lawgiver,' 'the great Theologian,' 'the great Statesman.' He must be considered, like all the saints and heroes of the Bible, as a man of marvellous gifts, raised up by Divine Providence for the highest purpose to which men could be called; and so, in a lesser degree, his name has been applied in later times: Ulfilas was called after him the Moses of the Goths; Arpad, the Moses of the Hungarians; Benedict, the Moses of the Monastic Orders."—P. 134.

It is just in this manner that the whole history of God's chosen people is treated by Dr. Stanley. Although Divine interposition is not denied, it always occupies a subordinate place, and the history is regarded as the history of any ordinary race. The manna which was rained from heaven is presumed to be nothing else than the droppings from the Tamarisk bushes which abound in the Desert. Even on this supposition the difficulty is not decreased, since it would have needed the intervention of as miraculous a power to have increased the Tamarisk droppings to a sufficient quantity for the maintenance of so great a multitude, as to have created a new thing upon the earth and to have fed men with bread, which was sent down directly from heaven. The occupation of Canaan, again, is represented as "but one of a succession of waves which have swept over the country, and each of which may be used as an illustration of those that have gone before and after, the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Greeks, Romans, Arabians, Turks, Crusaders, French, English have followed in their wake; the Philistines, the Canaanites, the aboriginal inhabitants accompanied or preceded them."

If the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham is so regarded, and if the record of the manner in which this fulfilment was brought about is so treated, the mysterious teaching, which every page of

Jewish history contains, must be altogether lost, and God's chosen people reduced to the level of any other nation.

Another specimen we will here give of Dr. Stanley's treatment of supernatural occurrences where a doubt is suggested in the text, and the solution contained in a foot-note. It is respecting the ass speaking to Balaam :—

"The dreadful apparition on the way, the desperate resistance of the terrified animal, the furious determination of the Prophet to advance, *the voice, however explained*, which breaks from the dumb creature which has saved his life, all heighten the expectation of the message which he is to deliver."—P. 189.

At the foot of the page is a note : "*Hengstenberg* (Geschichte Belems, 50—54) represents it as a dream or trance." In any other book than the Bible no one could doubt that an occurrence so circumstantially related was at least believed by the author to be an actual fact. The manner of the narrative, and the allusion made to it by S. Peter, forbid us to understand it in any other than a literal sense ; but the mind of Dr. Stanley apparently cannot rise into the region of the supernatural, and therefore, although he has not courage to assert it, he suggests the possibility that it may have been nothing, after all, but an illusion and a dream.

Again, we see the unfairness of Dr. Stanley, in his attempt to throw discredit on the description of the Rephaim, and the aboriginal inhabitants of Western Palestine :—

"Their lofty stature," he says, "is often noticed. It is possible that this impression may partly be derived from the contrast between them and the diminutive Hebrews, in like manner as a similar description, from a like contrast between the Northern races of Europe and the small limbs and features of the Italians, is given by Roman historians and poets of the gigantic Gauls."—P. 206.

Elsewhere Dr. Stanley refers to Mr. Cyril Graham's contribution to the Cambridge Essays, in his description of the natural features of the Transjordanic territory ; but he entirely forgets that the whole aim of Mr. Cyril Graham's essay is to prove, from the monumental remains of that land, that evidence still exists which proves that it was once inhabited by a gigantic race, exactly agreeing with the description given in Scripture. It is not one city only, but many, which are still to be seen desolate and uninhabited, yet not in ruins. The streets and houses are perfect, and what is still more remarkable, the stone doors still hang upon their hinges. Their massive appearance impresses the traveller with the conviction that the people who constructed these cities were not only a powerful and mighty nation, but individuals of greater strength than ourselves ; and thus we see how contemporaneously with the

growth of scepticism, God in His Providence has provided that the discoveries of modern research shall throw additional light upon the truth of the Mosaic records. Mr. Layard, Professor Rawlinson, Mr. Cyril Graham, and others who travel in the same track, will do more to build up, than Dr. Stanley and Bishop Colenso can avail to throw down.

The extermination of the Canaanites is attributed, not to the Divine command, but to the natural impulses of the Jewish people, for which allowance must be made in an age which preceded the promulgation of the new law of love. Although the restraints are greater, human nature is still the same; and therefore, concludes Dr. Stanley, "we have no right to find objections to those portions of Scripture, when we acknowledge the same feelings in ourselves and others without reprobation." (P. 251.) Two instances are added: one is that of Oliver Cromwell, concerning whom an extract from Carlyle is given; and the other is a quotation from a letter written in India during the mutiny. "The Book of Joshua is now being read in Church; it expresses exactly what we are all feeling. I never before understood the force of the Bible. It is the only rule for us to follow." (P. 251.) In spite of Dr. Stanley's apology, we think there must be a strange confusion in his mind between an exceptional command given for an express purpose, and the ordinary principles of Christian duty. After this we cannot be surprised at a comparison between Jael, the wife of Heber, and Charlotte Corday.

Dr. Stanley does not deny that all that was done was brought to pass under God's direction. If he had done so, his language would have been more consistent, and his position more intelligible. Phinehas had received God's approval of his zeal (Numbers xxv. 11—13), but the following words at least imply a censure:—

"They (the Reubenites) were pursued by Phinehas, ready for another sacred war, like that in which he had destroyed the Midianites. The whole transaction is an instance of what has often occurred afterwards in ecclesiastical history. What was meant innocently, though, perhaps, without due regard for the consequences, is taken for a conspiracy, a rebellion, an attempt to overthrow the faith. There are always theologians keen sighted to see heresy in the simplest orthodoxy, and superstition in the most harmless ceremony." "The solution of the controversy between the two pastoral Eastern tribes and their Western brethren in the Jewish Church is one which might have saved the schism of the Eastern Church from the Western, and prevented many bitter controversies and persecutions in all Churches."—P. 219.

The lectures which treat of the history of the Judges are written with a masterly pen. The descriptions are graphic and eloquent,

and the story is ably worked out, chiefly under the guidance of Ewald. Valuable, however, as these lectures are, the Divine element is uniformly omitted, even in a more ostentatious manner than in the case of Moses and Joshua. The Judges were raised up as dictators evoked from amongst the people by the circumstances under which they were placed. This much it will be sufficient to say, since to enumerate the objections which we must make to this treatment would only be to repeat again what has been said before.

For the tribe of Levi, or the sacred ordinance of the Priesthood, Dr. Stanley has neither love nor veneration. We can scarcely read a dozen pages without lighting on some of the bitter taunts which he is continually throwing out against the priests of every age. He doubts whether Samuel was sprung from the tribe of Levi, although Ewald has reconciled the apparent discrepancy between 1 Sam. i. 1, and 1 Chron. vi. 22, by the more than probable suggestion that Levites were often called by the names of the tribes amongst whom they resided. The sin of Saul did not consist in the usurpation of an office which did not belong to him, but only in impatience and want of self-control, which led the king to break through the moral restraint imposed upon him by the Prophet. From his hatred of sacerdotalism arises Dr. Stanley's view of the Prophetical office, as established to counteract the influence of the priesthood. After all that was remarked on this subject in an article which lately appeared in our pages, it is sufficient now to repeat, that we cannot believe that He, Who is not a God of confusion, but of order, should have committed the teaching of His people to two rival institutions, each designed to counteract the influence of the other.

We would be the last to deny that there was a human side to the circumstances under which the Prophets spake; and therefore it is not to this that we object, but to the constant omission of all besides. Many an instance might be found of Dr. Stanley's inconsistency, as, for instance, when he asserts that no higher theory of inspiration is held by the Church of England than that which is expressed in the collect before the Communion Service, and yet presently afterwards refers to the article in the Nicene Creed, "Who spake by the Prophets;" but we deem it sufficient now to record our solemn protest against the entire manner of treating Scripture employed by the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. The inconsistencies, however, which occur we cannot attribute to carelessness, but to the incompleteness of his theory—would, indeed, that it may ever remain as incomplete as now! But it needs not the seer's prescience to divine the end; and therefore it is that we regard Dr. Stanley as no less dangerous a guide than the Bishop of Natal.

UNDOGMATIC CHRISTIANITY.

Undogmatic Christianity. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, May 3, 1863. By the Rev. W. W. SHIRLEY, M.A., Select Preacher; Tutor and late Fellow of Wadham College. J. H. and J. Parker.

MR. SHIRLEY, like Professor Mansel, is not by training or by profession a theologian; but, living in that University where the foundations of the Faith have been so rudely shaken by Professors Stanley and Jowett, he has been led to ask himself whither things are tending. His own sympathies up to this time have evidently been in favour of freedom of inquiry. He is quite a man of the present age, and considers that the disparagement of dogmatic theology is the necessary result of a general movement of thought, in which he has not failed to take his share. Unlike many others, however, he has been able to hold the balance fairly; and thus weigh the *pros* and *cons* of the prevailing disposition of men's minds.

"In nothing has the present century been more happily contrasted, especially with its immediate predecessor, than in the desire, which has been felt by men of the most various tempers and opinions, to throw themselves as far as possible into the position of others, to learn to appreciate what is good, to allow largely for what is weak or bad in the motives, the opinions, the actions of others. We owe to this desire a large, an inestimable debt, intellectual no less than moral. But it has not brought an unmixed good. It has tended, beyond all question, to obscure the immutable distinction between truth and falsehood. It has tended to make men act as though a blind fate ruled in the regions of the understanding, bearing them with resistless force towards certain inevitable conclusions—conclusions which are the mixed result of the working of truth, of the prejudice of position, of the various *idola* which beset the intellect of man, but which nevertheless he is incapable of resisting, which he must perforce admit and believe. The office of the conscience as regards the intellect is then narrowed and degraded, until little is left to her but to compel the honest expression of opinions, over the formation of which she has not been permitted to watch.

"This is certainly an extreme position, and one which upon reflection most educated men would probably reject; but it is one, nevertheless, which, either thoughtlessly or partially accepted, is exercising a large influence upon society, and has placed its unmistakeable stamp upon the popular literature of the day.

"On the other hand, in a spirit hardly less unfavourable to the claims of specific doctrine, men of a higher and more philosophical mind, rising above this paltry individualism, with its miserable isolation of man from man, have endeavoured to take their stand, like the Epicurean poet of old, upon an elevation superior to the little conflicts of opinion. Carry-

ing a broad survey over the face of Christendom, past and present, they have endeavoured to eliminate the truth by some process of exhaustion, in the hope that they may repose at last on that, as their ultimate and necessary faith, upon which all Christians in all times and in all Churches have agreed. Or again, and far more commonly, without entering upon the study of theology at all, they take their stand upon those broad principles of generalization, which they have already applied, with such large and often questionable results, to other branches of knowledge: and conclude, with the rapidity and the confidence of men accustomed to handle such powerful methods of analysis, that Christianity as commonly understood is manifestly at variance with these general laws. It is too mechanical, too individual, too much the creature of time and place: therefore it too must be generalized, it too must be transformed into harmony with modern thought.

"In these and a thousand other ways which time would fail me to describe, a state of opinion has grown up among us which is singularly unfavourable to the reception of dogmatic truth; a state of opinion most difficult to encounter, most hard to modify, because it has grown up by the exaggeration or perversion of principles which it has cost us a hard struggle to establish, and from which we have derived a rich harvest of results."—Pp. 15—17.

Now it is because Mr. Shirley thus fully enters into and appreciates the intellectual difficulties of the present day that we consider his testimony to be of very great value. He affirms that these difficulties do not spring out of the advances made by science or criticism, to which he considers that more might without danger be conceded than they are likely to establish, but that they are after all the old rising of independency against authority. He maintains that real progress must be not towards vague generalities, but towards clearer definitions of doctrine, and that the knowledge of the unlearned, though sufficient for this, is surely not to be compared with that of the theologian.

But admitting that difficulties exist, what, he asks, is our true course in relation to them?

"Do we owe it to Christian wisdom and Christian kindness to bide our time, to throw differences into the background, and to put forward that side of Christianity which is most calculated to attract in the present day? or would such a course be a sacrifice of principle and a betrayal of our cause? Is this—to put in another form what is in truth the same issue—is this a case where mutual explanations will place men upon an amicable footing; where those who are now opposed need but to understand each other's position, in order to join heart and hand? Or is it a case of irreconcilable difference; of principles, brought face to face, the one tending to the maintenance, the other to the destruction of Christianity? I cannot doubt that it is even this; that the issue is as broad as that put by Elijah to Israel: 'If JEHOVAH be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him.' If undogmatic religion, with its large facility of accommodation to the requirements of modern thought, be also capable of imparting the strength, the conso-

lation, the hope we need, if it be indeed that which God has commanded, and on which His blessing rests, let us embrace it without reserve. But if not; if the faith of Christendom be inextricably interwoven with its system of doctrine; if indeed it stands or falls with the truth of creed and article, with the truth of miracle and prophecy; let us not attempt to disguise its character, to conceal the features of it which give difficulty or offence. Let us remember that if the words of our LORD, if the counsels of His Apostles, if the history of the Church be true, the bolder is also the safer course. It is not an accommodated, modified Christianity, but Christianity in all its abruptness, in all its definiteness, in all its undisguised enmity to the world, that has won the battles of the Cross. The Church of CHRIST has ever been most powerful, not when diffused the most widely, but when believing the most intensely. Some of its noblest triumphs have been won over error; its creeds have been the pæan of its victory.

"Let us then avow, without shame or fear, that there is something in Christianity which is not altogether in harmony with modern thought; let us add, which has never been altogether in harmony with the thought of any generation of men.

"Wherever the Church has had vital power, wherever 'CHRIST crucified,' the CHRIST whom Paul preached, has been fearlessly proclaimed, there also has been found the 'offence of the Cross;' there also have men been heard to suggest that a system so beautiful, so powerful, so godlike, needed but some slight modifications, needed but to be divested of that too mechanical character with which, in the popular mind, it had become invested, in order to bring it into accordance with the temper of philosophy, and to hand over to it in undisputed sovereignty the empire of the human mind. The kingdoms of this world have many a time been spread before the eye of the Church: they have been offered to her dominion, if only she would fall down and worship some one else than her LORD. For to this in truth it comes. When men have cast in the teeth of the Church the too mechanical character of her teaching, they have in reality recoiled from her intense tenacity of doctrine. And that tenacity is a law of her very being. Revealed religion is by its very nature dogmatic to the core. It declares upon the front of it that the original law of man's nature has been broken. It speaks not of the development of perfect and immutable laws, but of the jarring effects of their breach, of the consequences of the Fall, of the extraordinary remedies which it required, of the disturbances even of the physical order of the world which those remedies involved. It speaks of spiritual disease and spiritual healing; of a mighty loss and its reparation. It places before us a continuous miracle, a stupendous interference of God for the redemption of His fallen creatures. It bids us believe in this and be saved.

"Such is Christianity, popular Christianity, ancient Christianity; Christianity as we have received it, as we have believed it, as by the grace of God we will believe it to the end."—Pp. 17—19.

We have thought it worth while to notice Mr. Shirley's Sermon thus at length, because it seems to us to hold out the hope of an awakening of the academical conscience to the very tremen-

dous consequences to which the undogmatic tendencies of the age, as popularised by Professor Stanley and the *Times*, are hastening us. For ourselves we cannot profess to see that any re-habilitation of theology is needed. But we suppose there are those who will only accept that which is expressed in the phraseology of their own day. To the existence of such a feeling Mr. Shirley seems to point in a passage which we will quote as the conclusion of this short article, only adding our own very cordial wish that he will address himself, as earnestly as may be, to the accomplishing of what he thus sees to be needed.

"The great doctrines of Christianity must be set forth one by one, and their importance shown, not only as being to a philosophical mind integral portions of the scheme of revelation, but as having each of them a practical bearing upon the daily life of the Christian. This is indeed a large work, a work which has been done before, but which may none the less require to be done again, and which, if the necessity for it be realized, may prove, under God's blessing, the means of reviving among us a healthy study of theology."—P. 12.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Ordinance of Preaching investigated. By the Rev. GEORGE HOLDEN, M.A. Rivingtons. 12mo. Pp. 139.

WE recommend this little volume to our readers' perusal, not only on account of the moderate and sober tone which characterise it; but chiefly because it calls attention to the fallacy which lies at the root of that sad Protestant error, which has substituted the hearing of sermons for the duty of worship. A theological blunder, as is often the case, has been built upon an etymological one. To confound the Sunday's half-hour's discourse with the Apostolic "Preaching," is a "Nominalistic" blunder of the grossest kind. It is the knowledge of the Gospel which is to save men, not the sermon. Undoubtedly "the Priest's lips should keep knowledge," and he should be "apt to teach," and be able to "speak with authority;" but as Hooker tells us, "anything publicly notified" is really "preached," and so there are a great variety of ways in which the Gospel is "preached." To instance only a few. The Gospel is preached by the Institution of the Church, "the pillar and ground of the Truth;" by the holy lives of Christians, who are CHRIST'S "Epistles;" by the edifying talk of Christians; by means of the Press—by any method, in fact, which communicates the knowledge of it, and so brings persons under the influence of Divine grace. Laity by consequence, in a certain sense, are preachers as well as the Clergy, and have a responsibility in respect of that obligation. The offices of the two are nevertheless perfectly distinct, and different words are used in the original Greek to express what each order respectively has in charge to do. The verbs κηρύσσω, διαγγέλλω, καταγγέλλω, express

usually the proclaiming the news of the Gospel by the Laity ; while the authoritative declaration of the Faith by the Clergy, is represented by *εὐαγγελίζομαι* (if to unconverted) ; by *διδάσκω*, or *λαλέω* (if to the baptized) ; *διαλέγομαι* meaning rather to dispute than to preach. This is not exactly the distinction given by Mr. Holden ; but we apprehend that it will be found to be more correct than his.

1. *The Prayer Book Noted and Pointed throughout all its Services, with numerous Chants and Accompanying Harmonies.* By the Rev. R. R. CHOPE, assisted by Rev. R. F. SMITH, Southwell, and JAMES TURLE, Esq., Organist of Westminster Abbey. London : Mackenzie, Paternoster Row, and Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.¹
2. *Accompanying Harmonies to the same.*

MR. HELMORE'S "Psalter Noted," and "Manual of Plain Song" have been now for some time fairly in possession of the field as the authorized exposition in the English Church of that Ritual music which has descended to her from past ages along with the deposit of Catholic doctrine. Mr. Heathcote's and Mr. Morton Shaw's respective *Uses* have just one church each, so far as we know, still adhering to them.

Mr. Chope's two publications above named, which at present do not go farther than the Psalms, is an effort to supersede Mr. Helmore. And, speaking simply in the interests of the Church, and without saying that we think it will succeed, we are by no means sorry that the attempt should be made. We have ourselves on a former occasion pointed out several improvements that might and ought to be made in Mr. Helmore's Manuals, and since that time a Musical Commission has been at work in Belgium inquiring into the history and principles of old Church music, of whose labours the present editors have, we believe, availed themselves.

The three objects which this work professes to secure are (1.) "The restoration of the tones to greater purity." Thus we have an entirely different mediation for the First Tone, avoiding the use of an accidental flat. Thus too the Fifth Tone 2nd Ending, and the Tonus Peregrinus, are disallowed. (2.) The keeping each tone in "its proper seat." In this way all transpositions² are forbidden, and each tone at once suggests its own proper character instead of being written at different times in different keys. (3.) The furnishing "a greater variety of arrangement than is generally met with." This is done through a very considerable multiplication of endings, and by a much more frequent change of tones than occurs in Helmore.

The music is printed according to the notation in ordinary use. A very earnest protest is made by the Editors against singing the tones in harmony. This, together with the inconvenient seat of some of the tones, will set many choirs against the book at first.

¹ We should strongly advise Mr. Chope to cancel his title page, which is very unworthy of a church book. Has not the too "numerous chants" too rather something of a deceptive appearance when applied to the most exclusive edition of the Gregorian Tones which has yet been published.

² An exception is made in behalf of the Seventh Tone, which is supposed in its proper seat to be too high for modern voices.

The Social Influence of the Prayer Book. A Lecture delivered at the Town Hall at Hanley, before the Young Men's Society, by A. J. B. BRASSFORD HOPE, Esq. London: Ridgway.

As a lecturer or popular writer it would not be easy to find Mr. Hope's equal. Joined to a fund of good humour, and a lively imagination, Mr. Hope possesses a large acquaintance with books and a retentive memory, all of which he brings to bear with great energy of purpose on the object to which he devotes himself.

In the present instance the lecturer has found a subject worthy of his pen, and in his pleasant and lively manner conveys information of a high order which will do great good wherever circulated.

"The Prayer Book, more than any other book which was ever turned out is a great national work. Shall I call it a great national epic? Shall I call it a great national song-book, or rather a solemn record of universal feeling, such as none other people ever produced?"—P. 11.

All nations, he argues, have an inward life which yearns for expression in its popular literature. Among the Greeks, he asks,—

"What was the great bond of sympathy, what was the great connecting link of that race? What made them more than all a nation, though split into so many governments? I reply, the poems of Homer. I do not prove it to-night: it stands to reason and to fact. Among the Romans there were old rustic ballads—ballads Lord Macaulay attempted to reproduce in his stirring 'Lays of Ancient Rome.' Those old ballads were very well for the Romans when the love of fighting remained, but when they became luxurious, critical, and fastidious, those old ballads were not enough. They claimed the empire of the world, and then a man of infinite ability if not of genius—the question is not yet solved whether he had real genius, or only the very highest class of that which yet falls short of genius—I mean Virgil—was appointed by Augustus, the consolidator of the new system, to write a poem embodying the national life of his countrymen, which the world has ever loved and cherished, but which is not Homer. Coming down to a later period, we have the Sagas of Scandinavia, and the Koran of the Mahometans. But let us take modern European nations, and see what we find. The stately traditional devotional offices of the undisturbed, unreformed Latin and Greek churches are written in a language not understood by the people, in a foreign and dead language, and that, without entering into their contents, shuts them out from being what I have foreshadowed. Is there anything to supply their place? Take Italy. There is that poem of Dante, a sacred inheritance, but not a folks-book, not a folks-song, in the sense I mean. Take Germany. Luther's hymns have a great influence on the religious and social relations of North Germany, but they are hymns and not a book. In Spain there is nothing, for the poem of the Cid is no more than an antiquarian relic. Proud France is even worse off than any other people—France has not even a claimant. I think, if we look back with something of an analytical spirit, we shall find that this lack had something to do with the marked instability of the French character and French institutions. If it is not a cause, it is at least an instructive result. The French are a standing puzzle. Taken individually they are eminently a philosophical and political people. In their corporate capacity their philosophy and their politics are at fault. Pick out any average Frenchman, and how much more cleverly for the most part will he talk off-hand than the Englishman in the same position. But look at him and his compeers as they bid up into a people. How little are

they able to guide themselves! How helpless they are by the side of Englishmen! Perhaps, as I have hinted, absence of some folks-book of the kind I have referred to may have its share in this difference, partly as cause and partly as result."—Pp. 13, 14.

Lucy and Christian Wainwright, and other Tales, (Masters,) is a very attractive work, and one which indicates no small capacity on the part of the writer should her powers develop as much as we see reason to expect. At present there is a certain incompleteness in her writings which mars the pleasure their right-mindedness and pleasing style would otherwise afford; her tales very seldom lead up to any definite result, although as far as they go they are extremely interesting. That entitled "Will no one do likewise?" is greatly superior to the others in this volume; it is really admirable, and but for its abrupt termination would be all that could be desired.

The Foundling, a Tale of the times of S. Vincent de Paul (Masters) is chiefly interesting for the account it gives of the first formation of the charity which has since become such a vast educational work in the hands of the Order founded by S. Vincent. The story of the foundling herself will no doubt interest children greatly.

Generally speaking we are disposed to receive with some mistrust histories of pious children who have died young, but the *Sketch of the Life of John Lee* (Mosley), simply and sensibly described, is not open to the usual objection. There is no account of miraculous conversion or false ecstasies, but a plain statement of the manner in which a child nurtured in the Church was enabled to preserve his baptismal grace through trial and suffering.

Help and Comfort for the Sick Poor, (Rivingtons,) has reached a fourth edition; and as far as simplicity and earnestness goes, it quite merits the popularity it has gained. Nevertheless we cannot but regard it as a great blot in such a manual, that among the "Duties of Sickness" no place has been found either for Confession¹ or Communion.² Indeed there is no mention of repentance, or the sending for a Priest.

We have great pleasure in recommending another little manual on the Catechism, *The Catechist's Easy Explanation*, by Mr. Hyde, (Masters.) It is short, but at the same time more exact than his former manual. In another edition, we would advise the substitution of the term Eucharist instead of "Lord's Supper."

We are glad to notice in the Rev. C. J. Black's *Little Primer for Christian Worship and Doctrine*, (Masters,) which upon the whole strikes us as too metaphysical—an earnest protest against the practice of laying on a *hand*, instead of *hands* by Bishops in Confirmation. Surely where only three or four are confirmed at once, (as is the rule of some Bishops,) it would be quite easy to lay both hands on each candidate.

¹ This omission extends to another popular manual, "Thoughts during Sickness," by R. B.

² Holy Communion is mentioned after "getting better."

We regret to find that the error of teaching persons that they go to the Bishop to confirm—not to be confirmed—survives among some of the Clergy, of whom we could have hoped better things. Mr. CAPARN's *Counsels and Warnings*, (J. H. and J. Parker,) are based on this capital error, and cannot, therefore, be recommended.

A Short Catechism on the Baptismal Vow and Confirmation, by the same publishers, besides being open to the same objection, betrays a general ignorance of theology, of which it may suffice to give one instance. In answer to the question, "What do you mean by the 'flesh?'" the writer teaches the catechumen to answer, "Our sinful *bodies*," instead of referring him to S. Paul, who tells us that "the flesh" is the old nature of man, which "lusts" continually against "the spirit," i.e., man's regenerate nature.

Church Rates and the Liberation Society, by the Rev. W. ACKWORTH, (J. H. Parker,) is a melancholy picture of the result of trying to conciliate Dissenters by the suppression of Church principles.

Two Sermons preached at the Inauguration of the Cambridge Branch of the English Church Union, by Dr. OLDKNOW and Mr. WROTH, are quite worthy of the occasion, and have helped, we believe, in evoking a hearty response from among the younger members of the University.

We are glad to see that the *Union* is also taking up the subject of an "Increase of the Episcopate" with its correlative of "the right of free election."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

SIR,—In the recent article on the "Irish Church," in your October Number of last year, (p. 439,) there is a statement, that in the Irish Church Education Society there is a "*custom* of receiving into union many schools, whose masters are Roman Catholics." On scrutinizing my authority for this statement—a printed one, and most trustworthy—I find that, *possibly*, I have been guilty here of a seeming overstatement, in calling that a custom which may have happened only once. To that extent—but only to that extent, I hope you will allow me to modify the sentence quoted.

By professing to require all scholars to read the Bible, and only Church children to learn the formularies of the Church, the Irish Church Education Society, in my judgment declares, that the Irish Church is not the teacher of the nation.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
The WRITER of the article on the
"Irish Church."

CLERICAL SUBSCRIPTION.

1. *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London on the State of Subscription in the Church of England and the University of Oxford.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker. 1863.
 2. *Subscription to the Articles. A Letter to the Rev. Professor Stanley.* By the Rev. J. B. MOZLEY, B.D., Late Fellow of Magdalen College. Oxford and London: J. H. and J. Parker. 1863.
 3. *The Way which some call Heresy. A Letter to the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England on Clerical Subscription.* By ANDREW JUKES, Formerly of Trinity College, Cambridge; and late Curate of S. John's, Hull. Second Edition. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1862.
- &c., &c., &c.

To the above list of recent brochures on the subject of Subscription we might well add the newspaper reports of the debate in the House of Lords on May 19 last upon Lord Ebury's Acts of Uniformity Amendment Bill. The pros and cons of the question were nearly all exhausted by the several speakers on that occasion, and resulted on a division in the rejection of the Second Reading of the Bill, that is, of the principle of the proposed measure of relief, by a majority of nearly two to one.

The arguments on either side were precisely those in vogue at Cambridge in Paley's day some hundred years ago,—the old saws illustrated with modern instances,—though one of the most telling points in favour of subscription, advanced in *the Moral and Political Philosophy*, has hitherto, so far as we have noticed, been overlooked by the present controversialists, viz., that some equivalent test is necessary as a *limitation to the exercise of patronage*. In Paley's own words, "If the species of patronage be retained to which we are accustomed in this country, and which allows private individuals to nominate teachers of religion for districts and congregations to which they are absolute strangers; without some test proposed to the persons nominated, the utmost discordancy of religious opinions might arise between the several teachers and their respective congregations. The requisition then of subscription, or any other test by which the national religion is guarded, may be considered merely as a restriction upon the exercise of private patron-

age.”¹ This point might have been wrought out with a special *argumentum ad hominem* force in an assembly consisting of church-patrons.

The line taken by Lord Ebury himself was that of Mr. Jukes’ pamphlet, from the standing-point of Dissent, exaggerated into the astounding allegation, that tests “*were the cause of hundreds of thousands of orthodox non-conformists standing aloof from the Church altogether*, because their ministers could not honestly give their unfeigned assent and consent to some hundreds of theological propositions, some of which are not easy to understand, and others appeared absolutely contradictory.” As if Mr. Jukes himself were not an instance in proof that not *subscription*, but *conformity* is the real difficulty with dissenters, and the positive assertion of a contrary doctrine, not mere scruples about declaring an unfeigned belief in the Church’s teaching, the true cause of “standing aloof from it.”²

Of the other speakers, the PRIMATE properly led the van of the opposition, explaining that the declaration simply meant “that the clergyman pledged himself to use the Prayer Book as it stood, —that he would conform to the Liturgy,” this implied “of course not only that he would read it, but that he believed it to be Divine truth.” The BISHOP OF LONDON thought Subscription “unnecessary, and therefore mischievous.” The BISHOP OF S. DAVID’S considered the grievance “microscopic,” and the question not worth raising, but supported the Second Reading. LORD LITTLETON was satisfied that liberty of opinion in the Church of England was not as things stood at present unduly restricted, and opposed it. The BISHOP OF OXFORD “did not believe the Subscription kept any conscientious man out of the Church,” (qu. Holy Orders?); he “never knew of one practical instance of a young man who in consequence of scruples arising from this particular declaration was prevented from entering the Church.” The removal of the test “would lead unconscientious men to suppose they were at liberty not any longer to believe with their hearts what they spoke with their tongues;” “the declaration imposed an intellectual, moral, believing assent to formularies, as distinguished from a mere ‘conformity,’ or use.” The BISHOP OF LLANDAFF suggested a middle course, by substituting the use of the words of the 86th Canon (“that the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used”) for the “unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained

¹ Moral and Political Philosophy, book vi. c. 10.

² Mr. Jukes, strictly speaking, did not *withdraw* from his ministry in the Church for the reasons stated in his pamphlet, but was in fact, before the publication of his scruples, *deposed* by his diocesan because of a sermon preached by him containing doctrines contrary to the Prayer Book.

and prescribed in and by the Prayer Book" required by the Act. The BISHOP OF CASHEL thought the proposed relief "beginning at the wrong end," the alleged grievance requiring nothing less than a revision of the Liturgy, Articles, and other formularies. EARL GREY supported the Bill, considering the declaration as "encouraging the use of formularies in a non-natural sense." These few bones of contention which contain the marrow of the debate, will enable one with but a moderate skill in parliamentary comparative-anatomy to put together the perfect skeleton, and to guess its full proportions.

The strength of Lord Ebury's own speech, it has already been pointed out, was drawn from the same topics as the third pamphlet on the above list. The Bishop of London's argument was identical with that set forth more explicitly in his chaplain's letter, although he professes to differ very materially from Dr. Stanley. The two lines of argument, as was remarked in more than one quarter at the time of the debate, are contradictory and suicidal, the advocates of relief themselves proving a strong case against the measure.

On the one hand, Professor Stanley, and those who hold with him, affirm, "All that is needed is the repeal of certain clauses of the two Acts of Elizabeth and Charles II., and of the 36th Canon. The Liturgy and the XXXIX. Articles would continue as much as they are now, and as they were before Subscription was required to them, the law of the State and the Church."¹

The idea is as old as Bishop Burnet, who (in the "History of his Own Times" *ad finem*) thought it "a better way to let such matters continue to be still the standard of doctrine, and censure those who teach any contrary tenets, than to oblige all who serve in the Church to subscribe them." With good reason then might the Bishop of S. David's assert the microscopical and infinitesimal importance, or rather unimportance of the proposed measure of relief; and even Dr. Stanley himself is ready to admit that "if the present ardour for theological inquiry, on the one hand, and the present disposition to narrow the boundaries of the Church, on the other, were to continue, the advantage gained by the abolition of Subscription would be *very slight*."²

Mr. Jukes' pamphlet very conclusively proves, in spite of Lord Ebury's barefaced assertion to the contrary, that not the *slightest* relief to the conscience of a sincere dissenter would be afforded by the abolition, so long as the *use* of the Baptismal Service, for example, or the Questions and Answers in the Ordinal were imposed upon the ministry. On the other hand, within the limits of the Church itself the facts of the case make it very patent that the utmost latitude of difference of opinion on certain imperfectly defined doctrines is compatible with Subscription. Indeed this fact

¹ A Letter, &c., p. 33.

² *Ib.* p. 60.

is curiously urged by the advocates of liberty as a reason for abolition. Whether the licence so allowed be not sometimes stretched beyond the legitimate range of truth and honesty it is not for us to determine; only so long as the trammel is thus easily evaded, it is absurd to protest against it as an undue restriction on liberty of thought.

At this point, then, crops up the mystery of the movement. For what is all this seemingly unnecessary much ado about what practically amounts to nothing? It is really difficult to suggest any other adequate solution than that accepted by the Primate and the Bishop of Oxford; viz. "that the removal of the test would lead unconscientious men to suppose they were at liberty not any longer to believe with their hearts what they spoke with their tongues." The declaration of assent and consent implies, said the Archbishop, "of course not only that he would read it, but that he believed it to be Divine truth." We do not suppose for a moment that Professor Stanley would deliberately maintain the possibility of a conscientious man addressing God in liturgical forms which he believed to be contrary to the truth; thanking God, for instance, that it had pleased Him to regenerate a certain infant, whose regeneration he believed had not yet taken place. But if he can use the form *ex animo* in a meaning which approves itself satisfactorily to his conscience, what possible grievance can be found in the further formal declaration of his consent? The objection, directly stated, amounts indeed to this: "I use of course, as I am bound to use, the Office of Public Baptism; and I use it, of course, conscientiously believing what I say; if I did not believe it, of course I should never dare to insult God by addressing Him in lying words;—but still I think it a very grievous shame that you should make me *say* that I believe it." Lord Ebury still further adds to the perplexity of this reasoning, by laying stress on the frequent *repetition* of subscription at different stages of one's clerical career; as if somehow when one had once condescended to make the declaration of consent, he would consider it a hard thing to check the possibility of a subsequent change of mind by requiring a renewal of affirmation on every fresh engagement. This is pretty much the same as if one marrying a second time should complain of being obliged to repeat the vow of special affection and fidelity; or another should object to being sworn afresh in a court of justice, as witness or jurymen in a different cause. It is not surprising that such strangely loose and inconclusive reasoning should have not merely failed of its object, but have resulted in an exactly opposite conviction, on the part of many minds, to that intended; viz. that an increased stringency, rather than a relaxation of the present clerical tests is needed to ensure a sincere and honest acceptance of the Church's formularies. For it would only be in accordance with the course of argument, to *add* to the declaration of "assent and consent to all and every-

thing," &c., that "I do moreover hereby solemnly promise that, if at any time hereafter any doubt or scruple shall arise in my mind, or any change of belief or opinion, affecting my conscientious use of the Prayer Book, I will instantly relinquish whatever office I may hold by virtue of the faith implied in this subscription."

Our own conclusion is, that Subscription, as it stands at present, is not simply and negatively unobjectionable, as allowing the utmost liberty of opinion on subject matters of faith, consistent with the teaching of revealed truth; but that it contains also the positive advantage of excluding those from Holy Orders, and the cure of souls in the Church, who cannot conscientiously assent and consent to the formularies they would be obliged to use; and is moreover incalculably beneficial as helping to regulate the minds of the clergy in their apprehension of theology, by reducing it to a more or less dogmatic form. In this regulative and didactic effect of the subscribed formularies, we strongly suspect, lurks the real *latens anguis* which causes so much shrinking and shuddering on the part of the Stanley and Tait school. It is simply a champing the bit which checks, and so teaches, the paces of the unbroken colt. They cannot bear to be obliged to trot, canter, and gallop *en regle*; and so they prick their ears, and arch their neck, and paw the ground, and snort, and break out into the natural "run," at the furthest possible extremity of the lunging rein.¹ It is surprising what trash, indicative of this highmettled temper and most impassible resistance, was suffered to find vent in what notwithstanding was a very able and interesting debate in the Commons on the 9th ult, on Mr. Buxton's Resolution. The wretched twaddle about "running in grooves" and "repeating shibboleths" was as rife as elsewhere. Even Mr. Buxton himself has the audacity to argue thus: "It would be well for the clergy, for those who hear them, and for the intellectual and religious life of the nation, that its teachers should have scope and latitude to think out their own thoughts. As things stood this was utterly denied them. They had given their positive adhesion to every sentence in the whole Book of Prayer—to every sentence in the Articles. There could scarcely be a single doctrine of theology which was not touched upon in the one and the other. The Articles alone were said to contain more than 600 propositions. Virtually, therefore, every clergyman had tied himself down to a specific conclusion on every question of theology. How could the minds of ministers of the Church work vigorously upon Christian truth while they were forbidden to move one inch beyond the notions that happened to prevail in the days of Charles II.? Anyone who was in the habit of thinking would feel how heavy would be the bondage to be hemmed in by such declarations."² Again: "No fully

¹ Thus much of the article was written before the debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Buxton's Resolution, June 9 last.

² Report of Debate in *Times*, June 10.

could be greater than that of trying to stay the stir of mind with such wretched barriers as these. If the Church still required from young men such an abnegation of all mental freedom, the worthiest would be the first to shrink from such a degrading bondage."¹ And again: "If the Church of England was to hold her own the minds of her ministers must work boldly. They must not merely repeat like parrots the phrases that had come down to them from the days of old. They must work out truths for themselves. It was neither to be wished nor hoped that the ministers of the Church should cut their views to one precise pattern."²

Other such stuff and rubbish abounded in the way of argument; as if "undogmatic theology" were not a logical impossibility; and as if traditional and Catholic doctrine did not necessarily imply a continued "form of sound words." The taunt of Sir G. Bowyer at the close of the debate was scarcely an exaggeration in reply to all this maundering: "He had heard a great deal about the comprehensive character of the Established Church, and about what was politically wise: but he had not heard one word about *truth*."³

"Undogmatic theology," however, is, we repeat, the main aim and end of the Stanley-and-Tait school; partly, we will suppose, from a good-natured and well-intentioned hope of comprehension; and partly, for the removal of what they have wit enough to perceive is the most effective of the "wretched barriers" to "a free handling of Holy Scripture," in accordance with modern criticism, science, and the spirit of the nineteenth century. To get rid of the existing theological nomenclature and phraseology, and to build up untechnical speculations on the bare historical facts of Christianity, is the sum and substance of their philosophy. And they have the wit, we say, to perceive that not the formularies themselves, but Subscription to them, is the root of what they deem the evil of dogmatic teaching. Without the preliminary declaration, the Articles and Prayer Book might get practically to have no more moral binding force *in foro conscientiæ*, than the Canons of 1603, as gradually the forms and laws of belief and practice embodied in them became obsolete or dormant. "But," (such is the piteous picture drawn by Mr. Buxton,) "if the clergyman looked before, he saw the Subscription he had taken already; if he looked after, he saw the one he might some day have to take; and the more he left the force of reason to rust in him unused, the better for him and for his family."⁴ Barring the most unjust imputation of dishonest motive to the subscribing clergy, this passage, no doubt, very reasonably appreciates the mental process which one continually meditating on authoritative formulæ, and "examining himself" from time to time, "whether he be in the faith," as conscientious men *will* do, naturally goes through before his religious opinions settle down into any definite system of belief.

¹ *Times Report of Debate.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

It is like what naturalists call "growth and increase under limit," which determines the specific forms whether of animal or vegetable life. The growth of an honest conscientious mind under the limits imposed by the subscribed formularies, is into a loyal earnest teacher of the Church of England, though doctrinally siding, it may be, with one or other of the two great parties in the Church. The first act of subscription is probably little more than an implicit acceptance of the Church's faith, simply as such ; with a secret intention, conscious or unconscious, of revoking beforehand and protesting against whatever is contrary thereto. Then follows the professional use and practical application of the formularies, which acquire a fixed, and seemingly their natural and grammatical meaning, though varying according as they are construed with a party bias ; and therefore with very considerable diversity of interpretation. Meanwhile, the progressive clerical mind is continually making a silent appeal to the words and phrases of the Prayer Book and Articles, in justification or condemnation of current opinions, and so learns to realize the supposed teaching of the Church, and to shape its own conclusions into agreement with the authorized standard. Precisely the same process goes on with respect to the interpretation and application of Holy Scripture.

Examining chaplains are sometimes astonished at the rapid progress that has been made in the realization of Church dogmas and Scripture phraseology, (with whatever interpretation) during the year of fresh professional thought and sermon-writing, which intervenes between the Deaconship and Priesthood. All this is perfectly consistent with an entire freedom and independency of speculation *within certain limits*, and on condition of ultimately reducing such speculation *to a certain form* ; consistent also with a sincere faith, a hearty churchmanship, and an honest subscription on the next occasion that demands one. There is life ; there is growth ; there is a continual expansion and accretion of the mental tissue ; there is nothing of the cold mechanical rigidity and base slavish stagnation of unrealized conformity ; though the result may be an almost endless diversity of doctrinal differences, and perpetual party controversy. It is a shallow and suspicious state of mind, that contends for the necessity of a non-natural interpretation in the case of a diversity of alleged meanings, or that fails to comprehend the rationale of co-existent opposite schools of theology, on the basis of the same formularies. Messrs. Newman and Oakley on the one hand, Messrs. Jukes and Baptist Noel on the other, could not conscientiously subscribe to *what seemed to them* the intentional meaning of the Church of England formularies, and honestly resigned their position in the Church. This test of *sincerity*, no doubt, is the whole and sole purpose of clerical subscription ; and the contention for the necessity of a non-natural interpretation, on the part of the subscribers themselves, is, we

repeat, in itself alone, a very suspicious sign. For although it might be possible to make out a few exceptional cases of morbid scruples or exaggerated literalness in interpreting formularies, (like that of the late Canon Wodehouse,¹) resulting in an unreasonable withdrawal from the ministry of the Church; the bulk of the conforming clergy, which constitute the two great High and Low, the Catholic and Protestant church-parties, assert most strenuously their hearty acceptance of the natural and grammatical meaning of the forms they use, and express no desire for, but strongly object to relief from subscription. The desire, we suspect, is limited to the section of the Broad school, more or less nearly identified with the Stanley following; and if the nineteen apocryphal young men, quoted by the Oxford Professor,² who went to Cambridge intending to take Orders, but relinquished their intention, "chiefly on the ground of subscription," were pupils of that school, the instances adduced are simply nothing to the purpose, since objection to the formularies would of course have formed no insignificant portion of their distinctive teaching. For our own part we place considerably more faith in the assertion already quoted of one possessing such long and wide reaching experience as the Bishop of Oxford³ (corroborated by our somewhat large past acquaintance among both candidates and clergy) that, "he never knew of *one* practical instance of a young man, who, in consequence of scruples arising from this particular declaration, was prevented from entering the Church."

The material question raised by this portion of the argument, opens up a large subject, which deserves a closer investigation than we can afford either space or leisure to bestow upon it now. "What is Truth?" is the one great crucial theme of disputation, which has perplexed men's minds, both in the Church and in the world, ever since and before the question was lightly thrown out by jesting Pilate. Practically, for our present purpose, it will be sufficient to define a truth to be, the notion entertained in the mind, of some object, or subject of thought, external to itself; and secondarily, the embodiment of this mental conception in human language, in order to communicate the same to other minds. Every truth, therefore, necessarily supposes three conditions,—the Reality, the Idea, the Word, corresponding with each other. Now, it is evident that the Divine Mind, and none other, can *fully* comprehend the true idea on any subject. And this idea can only be communicated to the finite mind of man in the form of human language. We sometimes question the fact of *verbal* inspiration, but indeed, it is im-

¹ Stanley's Letter, p. 55. The relations of Church and State, and the Royal Supremacy, have more commonly than theological dogmas, been bugbears with this class of minds.

² Stanley's Letter, p. 31.

³ Speech in House of Lords, May 19, 1863, as quoted above.

possible for the human mind to conceive an idea or thought at all on any subject except in the form of words. If inspiration means therefore, the communication of some idea, it *must* certainly be verbal inspiration. An idea *is* a word, as it exists in the human mind. No human mind, however, we repeat, can *fully* comprehend the true idea. Men's minds are of different capacity; and though some may more nearly approach the true idea than others, the most capable can take in only greater or less portions of the truth. This is only saying, that the most exact, and perfect, and exhaustive form of words, words most nearly corresponding to the Reality expressed by it, must after all fail of conveying exactly the same meaning to different minds. That is, no form of human language can thoroughly express the truth. We can but approach the true idea nearer and nearer, by taking it in piecemeal, and viewing it in its different aspects.

This statement will explain what is meant, when it is said that we must take Holy Scripture as a whole, and not any single texts, as expressive of the truth. It will explain also the apparent doctrinal discrepancies of Holy Scripture, such as the Pauline and Jacobean teaching about faith and works. It will explain, in good measure, the like apparent discrepancies between certain formularies of the Church. It will explain the fact and, we may venture to presume, the Providential purposes of Parties in the Church. More and more of the truth in different subjects is thus wrought out on the principle of "progression by antagonism;" in other words, the true idea is viewed on its different sides, by earnest, honest, meditative minds, in different measure, according to their intellectual and moral capacity for receiving it.

But, though no possible form of words, however perfect, (not even the inspired words of Holy Scripture,) can adequately represent the whole truth on any subject, especially the Divine truths of Revelation, or again can convey identically the same meaning to many differently constituted minds; yet for all needful practical purposes they can do so; so far as they go, they may be accepted as common definitions, and be made the basis of agreement. They can at least with sufficient precision declare what is *not* the truth on any subject. And this is the reason why dogmatic forms (e.g., the Athanasian Creed) so often run into a series of negations, closing up as inadmissible certain false ways of interpretation by which the truth might be sought to be approached. With the exception perhaps, of the first five, our XXXIX. Articles are scarcely more than an *apologetic manifesto*, pronouncing not so much positively what the Church of England holds on certain subjects, as what it desires to be exculpated in the eyes of Christendom from the blame of holding. It is liable to and chargeable on the one hand, we will suppose, with arbitrary scholastic refinements, mediæval exaggerations, unreal foreign peculiarities; on the other,

with various abuses in a contrary direction ; and therefore it secures itself with a safeguard and protest on both sides. Within that compass there still remains, as has been shown, much neutral and debateable ground. And opinions in the Church naturally gravitate towards one or other of the extreme opposite directions. Hence have arisen the two great parties into which churchmen, and especially the clergy, are divided, which approach the same truths from contrary sides, help to check, counterbalance, yet stimulate each other, to hold each other from entering on interdicted paths, yet each are ready to vindicate, with the force and strength of combined numbers, for the individual followers of its own way of teaching, the most perfect liberty of thought and judgment on all fairly open questions. Abolish formularies, and break up the Church-parties which have grown up under their limits, and for two common forms of dogma you will get as many hundreds as there are varieties of mental and moral capacity of conception ; a rapid drifting away of masses from the analogies of the faith, (as has happened in the case of so many communities separate from the Church,) a continual increase of discord, bigotry, intolerance, persecution, in proportion to the multiplication of petty schools of thought ; a self-willed, unchecked tyranny of clergy over the laity, of Bishops over the clergy and candidates for orders.

On this point we set out intending to lay, perhaps, the principal stress of the whole argument, but that we find ourselves most effectually anticipated by the late debate in the Commons. We will briefly remark that the laity may well thank themselves that there is a Church Catechism to fall back upon in preparing for Confirmation, a Prayer Book and XXXIX. Articles, which have been subscribed, when they listen to their weekly sermon. And candidates for orders, or clergy entering a new diocese, may equally be thankful that, as things stand at present, they can appeal from the accidental caprice of individual Bishops to their readiness to accept and subscribe the Church's own authoritative standards.

It is somewhat astounding that Dr. Stanley should contrast the liberty of the English clergy, in this respect, with that of those of the Roman Catholic and other Churches, to the advantage of the latter. Thus, "The Roman Catholic and the clergy of the Eastern Church neither formerly nor now are bound by any definite forms of Subscription. The unity of the Church is preserved everywhere, not by preliminary promises or oaths, but by general laws of discipline and order, and by the general public sentiment¹ of the whole community."² And in a note he says, "From the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church no subscription is required

¹ If there is one thing more untrustworthy than another it would be "the public sentiment" on any religious question in England.

² Letter, &c. p. 36.

at all, nor at their ordination any declaration of belief. But when they enter on any cure or any office of instruction, they recite aloud the creed of Pope Pius IV., which is the faith equally of every Roman Catholic layman."¹

On this view of the subject, we have two remarks to make. First, we repeat that it is perfectly marvellous that so staunch a Protestant and Liberal should have the hardihood to maintain the practically greater liberty of theological speculation permitted to Roman Catholic compared with English clergy; (and without this supposition, we can see no force or applicability in the argument.) And next, we honestly declare that no single illustration of the subject has so forced on us the conviction of the exceeding danger of *conformity without subscription*, as the revelations which have sometimes been made (take, for example, the testimony of Blanco White) of the secret infidelity of the Spanish and Italian, and again, of the German and Genevan clergy; to which latter body, in our opinion, there was not a very felicitous reference in Mr. Buxton's speech—"that the Church of Geneva was actually persuaded by an English Bishop—Bishop Burnet—to give up Subscriptions, and the argument he used was that the worthiest men were thus driven away, 'while,' said he, 'others are induced to submit and begin their ministry with mental equivocations.'"² Certainly, if "working well or ill" be considered a fair criterion of the general effectiveness of either system, the Church of England, with her Acts of Uniformity still unabrogated, need not shrink from comparison with the above or any other religious communities.³ Nor, we will add, with herself at any former period of her history. There were some strange rhetorical allusions, indeed, in the late debate to a "golden era of the Church of England" before these tests were introduced, in the days of "her great statesmen, her great theologians, her noble army of martyrs," to which it was desired to revert. But since subscription was enforced early in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it is really difficult to make a guess what possible period was referred to; whether that of Mary, or Edward VI., or Henry VIII., or some halcyon season anterior to the Reformation. It does not however much matter what. The allusion, of course, like Dr. Stanley's implied preference for the moral and intellectual condition of the Roman Catholic clergy was a mere flimsy sophism; while we must say of the latter, it was quite unworthy of the writer. Why, the very ground of justification of England's separation from the Roman obedience urged from the beginning has been the imposition of intolerable restrictions on the part of Rome! "The true reason for separation,"

¹ Letter, &c. p. 36.

² *Times Report of Debate*, June 10.

³ Mr. Newdegate quoted M. Guizot to prove that "the Protestant Church in France was too incompletely organized;" and exposed the incoherence of all Protestant communities in America.

says Chillingworth,¹ "is not so much because you *maintain* errors and corruptions, as because you *impose* them, and have so ordered your communion that either we *must* communicate with you in these things or nothing." And Bishop Taylor to the same effect, "Whether of the two is the schismatic, he that makes unnecessary and inconvenient *impositions*, or he that disobeys them because he cannot, without doing violence to his conscience, believe them; he that parts communion because without sin he could not entertain it, or they that have made it necessary for him to separate by requiring such conditions, which to no man are simply necessary, and, to him in particular, are either sinful or impossible."²

The second pamphlet on our list is a clever and well-written attempt to reconcile certain uneasy consciences to the yoke and burden of subscription. It admits, however, of very limited application, and refers exclusively to what may be called the subjective Articles (IX. to XVIII.), relating to original sin and free will—Articles which we think that Mr. Mozley must have selected with the view of setting forth a certain unfortunate excess of love for those Articles which his last work betokened. It is obvious to remark that the consciences only of a very small section in the Church of England, feel the smallest scruple in accepting the Church's dicta on these subjects. And to these few the remedy suggested would, we imagine, prove almost as impracticable as the original grievance. It may be simply stated thus: the articles in question are couched almost verbatim in the language of Holy Scripture,—in the language of S. Paul;—you have accepted the statements when you found them in the Bible, and with a certain reserved meaning of your own; apply the same rule of interpretation to the human formulary. Small comfort this to those who have *not* yet got over the difficulty presented to their verifying faculty by Scripture statements on this subject, and who would feel not certainly a less degree of scrupulosity in declaring an "unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained in" the Bible! The author himself seems aware of this failure in his argument. He says, "Were the representative document to go" (i.e. the Prayer Book and Articles,) "the original document itself," (i.e. the Bible) "would still remain to be the subject-matter of conflicting explanations, to be language accepted by all alike and understood by different sections differently, and to be the basis of doctrinal variety under the form of one and the same subscription."³ For ourselves we protest altogether against this principle of interpretation. The formularies do *not* stand simply on the same footing as Holy Scripture; they are *the Church's interpretation of Holy Scripture*. And they who subscribe them pledge themselves to accept Holy Scripture, not as interpreted by themselves, but as interpreted by the Church.

¹ The Religion of Protestants, ch. v., sec. 357, quoted by Mr. Jukes.

² Liberty of Prophesying, sec. 22, quoted by Mr. Jukes.

³ Subscription to the Articles, p. 27.

We must now close these remarks with three weighty, and it seems to us, apposite quotations. The first, from a no less ancient, grave, and reverend authority, than Lord Bacon.

"Certainly there be," he says in his first Essay, "that count it a bondage to fix a belief—affecting free-will in thinking, as well as in acting,—and, though the sects of philosophers of that kind be gone, yet there remain discoursing wits, which are of the same veins, though there be not so much blood in them as was in those of the ancients."

The next is from the present Archbishop of Dublin, commenting on the same Essay, which comment we accept, though with a somewhat different intention.

"We have lived to see the system called '*phenakism*,' '*double doctrine*,' or '*economy*,' that is, saying something quite different from what is inwardly believed, not only practised, but openly avowed and vindicated, and those who practise it, held up as models of pre-eminent holiness, not only by those of their own party, but by others also."

And we conclude with the passage from Professor Stanley's letter, with which before all others we most heartily agree.

"Subscription and abolition of subscription, are alike only means to ends. If the end can be accomplished in any other way, if the comprehensiveness, the influence, the truthfulness, and the faith of the Church of England,—if the interests of learning and religion at Oxford, can be better maintained by retaining subscription than by removing it, then *by all means retain it.*"—P. 64.

MR. BOYLE ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

The Inspiration of the Book of Daniel, and other portions of Holy Scripture, with a Correction of Profane and an Adjustment of Sacred Chronology. By W. R. A. BOYLE, of Lincoln's-Inn, Barrister. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1863. 8vo., pp. 673.

THIS is a very valuable book, and it is most carefully and candidly written. The writer follows very much in the steps of Mr. George Rawlinson, in bringing the more recent discoveries of Egypt and the Nile to bear upon the difficult, arduous question of sacred chronology; upon which subject Mr. Palmer's Egyptian Chronicle stands unrivalled. Mr. Boyle, in his preface, explains his object in compiling this book; that it is "an effort to establish more fully the inspiration of Holy Scripture"—"to open a way through the tangled mass of dates which has hitherto hid the Christian æra from view." He alludes to the utter failure of the late attack

upon the Pentateuch: "A mighty struggle is going on. The principles assailed are the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and the Divinity of our LORD. It is to subvert these fundamental truths that the later Oxford movement has been originated;" to remove what the "Oxford Liberal" terms "the scandal of Trinitarian subscription,"—the demanded latitude being "no less than the withdrawal of all Christian doctrines as a test or qualification for Holy Orders. The aim is to pluck CHRIST out of Christianity, and so to convert His religion into Socinianism, Pantheism, or simple Deism." To cement the stability of that sacred structure which contains "that religion which was delivered by Moses and the Prophets, by CHRIST and His Apostles," is the object of Mr. Boyle's book: a noble and worthy object in itself, and well and worthily has he carried it out. He has spared no pains to make his book as complete as possible, being animated, as he says, by "a determination, at any sacrifice of time and labour, to arrive at the truth on a subject of such momentous concern." Working and writing with this design and in this spirit, Mr. Boyle cannot have gone far beside his mark; so that we are not surprised to find that his book turns out to be the production of a Christian gentleman of considerable intellectual ability, of fair scholarship, of unwearied pains and assiduity.

Mr. Boyle has divided his work into four books. The *first book* treats of the objections which have been raised against the prophecy; the language of Daniel; the character of his earlier chapters; the age of Darius; the divisions of the Persian Empire; the history of Belshazzar; the alleged Greek forms in Daniel; Nebuchadnezzar, his image and his insanity; lastly, Daniel's acquaintance with the contemporary manners and customs. The *second book* investigates the Eastern imagery and symbolism which was used by the earlier Prophets, Joel, Amos, Hosea, &c.; the symbolism of Daniel, his empires, horns, ram and he-goat, his "little horn." The *third book* is occupied with the testimonies to the antiquity of the prophecy of Daniel. The *fourth book* works out the question of the *seventy weeks* in their first, and second, and third divisions, in which every writer and chronological table is pressed into the service. The chief labour of the work lies in this last book, upon which its critical value mainly rests; yet, to the general student there is very much to interest in the other topics, which do not require so lengthened or profound a study. We proceed to point out some of the more generally interesting portions of Mr. Boyle's book, amongst which his chapter on the alleged Greek forms in Daniel takes a foremost place. (Book i. c. vii. pp. 46—69.) There are very few words of Greek origin in Daniel, and these tend to prove its antiquity rather than the reverse. Mr. Boyle states the opinions of Clinton, Meier, Max Müller, Levesque, Fürst, De Gebelin, Pritchard, Halhed, Sir W.

Jones, as to the general coincidences of the Semitic and Indo-Germanic languages. He quotes the statements of Fürst and Meier that "the whole of the acknowledged Sanscrit roots given by Pott are likewise common to the Semitic language." Dr. Rowland Williams, who well knows the distinction between Greek and Macedonian words, tried to attribute to the Prophet Daniel Macedonian words; and Mr. Boyle has detected this imposture in more instances than one. Herodotus noticed the similarity between the Greek and the Persian names of festivals; and the coincidence is most complete as to deities, mythological persons and places, numbers, articles of clothing, the names of animals and of spices. "So many and various are the resemblances, both structural and verbal, to be found in these two families of languages, that it would require a strong case indeed to fasten upon the Book of Daniel a later day on any philological grounds." There are only *ten* such words brought forward at all, two of which belong to the same root; and they are only found in the Aramean chapters: the pure Hebrew does not contain a single example of them. The first two of these words—*parthemim*, *πρότιμοι*, princes; and *pithgom*, *φθέγμα*, sound, or voice—are on all sides allowed to be of Persian origin. The third word, *nebhizva*, *νόμισμα*, signifies gift, in Chaldee, but coin, in Greek. "It is allowed to be either Persian, or else formed from a Chaldee root, neither of which has the meaning of money, conveyed in the Greek—a signification manifestly unsuitable to the passage in Daniel." (P. 53.) The fourth word is *pattish*, *πέτασος*, a coat in Chaldee, a hat or a head-covering in Greek: it is derived from the Syriac *petsho*, and not from the Greek. The fifth word is *cheraz*, *κηρύσσειν*, and *charoza*, *κήρυξ*, a herald; both to proclaim and a herald, flow from a root widely diffused in Chaldee and Syriac, and in the Indo-Germanic languages, probably itself of Semitic origin. The sixth word, *sabb'cha*, *σαμβύκη*, sacbut, is a musical instrument of great antiquity, the origin of which was foreign to the Greeks as the name itself. The next word is the name of a musical instrument, *pesanterin*, *ψαλτήριον*, psaltery. We give our author's remarks upon this word in his own words, to show how minutely he has investigated the question:—

"No. 7 has an accidental similarity of sound with the Greek word *ψαλτήρ*, from which De Wette would derive it. This, however, never signifies a stringed instrument, but always the player upon it. The identity with *ψαλτήριον* can as little be made out. Under *pesanterin* Gesenius indeed assigns to it a Greek derivation, and assumes it to have been introduced by the Macedonian conquest because of the substitution of *n* for *l*. But the same Gesenius, under *λ*, says that this letter is interchangeable with any of the liquids, and especially with *γ*; and he there gives *psanterin* among others as a word with which the Macedonians had nothing to do. Among Gesenius' examples he cites Herodotus, who gives the name of Labynetus to the Nabonnedus of Be-

rosus, and others of the Chaldees. As this change of liquids was thus common among the Greeks, so it was one customary with the Orientals, in adopting Greek words, and did not come through the Macedonians. They could not, in fact, have pronounced *psalterin*, though, with a tendency to nasalize everything, they could manage such a word as *psanterin* tolerably well. The change of *n* and *l* is common to the whole Dorian race; and, independently of the Greeks, it is a euphonic rule among the Semites."—P. 54.

To this passage a note is appended: "No Chaldee scholar would write *Psanterion* as Dr. Rowland Williams has done." (Essays and Reviews. No. 2. p. 76.)

The eighth word is *sumphoneya*, *συμφωνία*, dulcimer, in the Greek symphony. This word is allied to the Syriac *tzephunyo*, *tuba*, *tibia*, whence probably it was derived. The Greek symphony implies a concert of sounds, or else a concert of vocal or instrumental music, or a union of both. It is only found in Polybius as meaning a musical instrument, who had no doubt met with it at the Tyrian and Persian colonies which he visited, for he was present at the capture of Carthage under Scipio Africanus. Meier the best hebraist of the Tübingen school, says that it is decidedly of Semitic origin. The tenth word is *kitharos*, *κίθαρις*, harp or rather guitar. As no root has been found for this word, a Greek root has been assumed for it; yet "the terminal *is* or *a* however, in Greek, seems to denote a word which was originally derived from another language, and has been modified and lengthened in its passage." (P. 56.) This *kithera* was very like to the *φόρμιγγις*, and to the *λύρα*, the former of which Homer attributes to foreign workmanship. It is well known that the Greeks adopted their musical instruments from other nations; Strabo and Athenæus both confirm this opinion. Mr. Boyle brings forward the analogy of the word *θάλασσα* Attic *θάλαττα*, which Berosus derives from the Chaldee *thalatth*, in favour of the word *kithera* being of Chaldee, Phœnician, or of Persian origin. Doubtless the names of musical instruments are *onomapoetic*, and they are analogous in languages totally distinct; so the *κίθαρις* of the Greeks became the *cithara* of the Roman, the *citharia* of the Italian, the *guitare* of the French and Germans, the guitar of the English. Mr. Boyle considers that the *kithara* had its birth-place even farther east than the *sambuca* or *lyre*, and that when the Assyrians conquered Tyre they were introduced, if not before, to the *kithara*, amongst the other inventions of Tyrian and Egyptian art. Greece was a land of poetry and music, long before the overthrow of Tyre, and Strabo, Berosus, Quintus Curtius, and other historians, bear record to the intercourse which was carried on between the Greeks and the Babylonians. In the days of Homer the Greeks had this very *kithara*. "Musical instruments were therefore common in Greece for several centuries before Daniel came into existence.

These, like other things, were no doubt articles of commerce, since the Greeks themselves had their markets for the sale and purchase of goods, which were either sought out by the Tyrians, or brought to them by others." (P. 63.) In Babylon there *must* have been a knowledge of musical instruments, which was known for six centuries from the Trojan war, or for three and a half centuries from the age of Homer to the time of Daniel.

Mr. Boyle well asks, "What would be said of a purely Saxon writer like Addison, for instance, being charged with being a Frenchman, a Spaniard, a Portuguese, an Italian, a German, or one out of the countless Asiatic nations, or with having borrowed from any of their languages, because the word *guitar*, or any other technical word, which had been current with all, were found in one of his numbers of the *Spectator*? Such a charge would be below contempt." (P. 68.) This investigation cuts the other way; Daniel's very words, from the absence of Greek in them, prove that he wrote before the Macedonian conquest, and long before the Maccabean age. The testimony is not negative; it is a positive testimony to the early date of this prophecy. Dr. Rowland Williams, by stating that the English, and Welsh, and Greek, and Sanscrit, all belong to one family of language, "thus clearly evinces his knowledge of the affinities between the Greek and Eastern languages. When therefore he affirms the existence of *Macedonian* words in the book of Daniel, as if this were an established fact, but gives no intimation that the only two which he cites as examples are the names of musical instruments, one of them at least having a very different signification from the Greek, he abandons all fair argument." (Note, p. 55.) This then is the sum of the argument: out of *twelve* chapters of the book of Daniel, *nine* words are excepted as being of *Greek* origin. "As respects six of these the charge palpably fails; there can be little doubt that it fails also as respects the seventh; it appears likewise to fail as to the eighth, though at the utmost the point is doubtful; and as regards the ninth, there is not only distinct proof of the foreign origin of the thing itself, but this and the two previous words are all of them names of *musical instruments*, which would certainly in the time of Daniel have already found their way to Babylon." (P. 67.)

We beg our readers, after having perused this cursory analysis of Mr. Boyle's elaborate argument upon this subject, to notice the way in which Dr. Rowland Williams assumes his proposition as proven, his statements as admitting of no controversy. "In distinguishing the man Daniel from our book of Daniel, and in bringing the latter as low as the reign of Epiphanes, our author only follows the admitted necessities of the case. Not only Macedonian words, such as *symphonia* and *psalterion*, but the texture of the Chaldaic with such late forms as *lachon*, *den*, and

illen, the pronominal *men* and *he* having passed into *nun*, and not only the minute description of Antiochus's reign, but the stoppage of such description at the precise date, B.C. 169, remove all philological and critical doubt as to the age of the book." (Essays and Reviews, p. 90. Edit. x.) The candid reader cannot fail to notice how triumphantly Mr. Boyle has disposed of Dr. Rowland Williams' first objection to the book of Daniel on account of the Greek words which it contains. The "texture of the Chaldee" is the next ground of argument. On this point we will transcribe Mr. Boyle's entire reply.

"The Hebrew of Daniel is so similar to that of Ezekiel, that some German critics have ventured to affirm that the pseudo writer imitated this Prophet. If the work were a forgery, his Aramean must have been an imitation, since another branch of this family was in use in Palestine during the time of the Maccabees. But in that case he would, there can be little doubt, have closely imitated the Chaldee of Ezra. This however is not the case, as the forms *lechen*, *lehen*, occur in Daniel, and those of *lechem*, *lehem*, in Ezra, with other variations. De Wette has correctly remarked, that what is now termed Chaldee was a mere *patois*. Consequently Ezra's Chaldee and Daniel's might well differ, and yet belong to the same period. There is no doubt that the termination *nun*, as in *ēlen*, is the ordinary Aramean plural form, while *men* is the ordinary Hebrew. The Chaldee of Ezra therefore approaches more nearly to the Hebrew, than that of Daniel to the Aramean form: but to assume that the one is the proper Chaldee of Nebuchadnezzar's time, the other of that of the Maccabees, is an assumption destitute of all foundation. Ezra's frequent use of (*dēn*) *dēnah* is of still further importance, as it shows that this interchange of *nun* and *he*, which is said to prove that Daniel's Chaldee is of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was in use also in Ezra's time. How utterly wild Dr. Rowland Williams is in his assumption, may be seen in the instance of *dēn* which he adduces as a proof that the author of Daniel wrote in Chaldee of Epiphanes' time. He gives it as an instance of *he* having passed into *nun* like *illēn*. The word however is not found in Daniel at all, but is a grammatical form to represent *denah* Chaldee for *zeh*, this (*hic hæc hoc*). The close resemblance of Daniel's Hebrew, with that of Ezekiel, is an argument of real weight, as the knowledge of pure Hebrew, or rather moderately pure, like Ezekiel's, was there can be little doubt, rare in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes; at all events it is so rare that the Targums, or translations into Chaldee, never came into ordinary use."—Pp. 28, 29.

Dr. Arnold had long since propounded an opinion that the book of Daniel was a forgery, because amongst other things, in Dr. Williams' words, it gave a minute description of Antiochus' reign. "In fact," writes Dr. Arnold, "you can trace distinctly the date when it was written, because the events up to that date are given with historical minuteness, totally unlike in character of real prophecy, and beyond that date all is imaginary." Mr. Boyle finds it rather difficult to affix a definite meaning to this definition of

imaginary as so used by Dr. Arnold. Of the prophecies in general Mr. Boyle writes :

“Many of these have not yet occurred, but most of them are described in terms no less precise than those which were to take precedence in point of time. It is most illogical therefore to select out of the entire number some few which have taken place, and conclude that the description of them must be past history and not prophecy, because capable of being identified with historical incidents of such prominence, as to have thrown upon them a blaze of light, and to set down others as imaginary, because yet involved in the mists which hang over all future occurrences ; until in the silent revolutions of time, they have likewise passed into the same clear light—the annals of a nation’s history. Let all the Maccabean events be subtracted, and there will still remain a number of predictions which from their chronological character, are far more specific than most of the Old Testament prophecies or the Apocalyptic visions.”—P. 368.

These propositions are maintained by Mr. Boyle in a most elaborate dissection of the contemporaneous history, and then he proceeds to prove beyond doubt, that the writer of the first book of Maccabees had before him the Alexandrine version of the book of Daniel, and the errors in this writer arise from his not understanding what idiom in the original was expressed by LXX. Words and phrases which are specified by Mr. Boyle, occur in the first book of Maccabees as borrowed carelessly and incorrectly from Daniel.

“What,” asks Mr. Boyle, “is the legitimate deduction from these premises ? why that at the time when the first book of the Maccabees was composed, the book of Daniel was already in existence, but was at this period an ancient book,—so ancient, as to contain words and expressions which were readily susceptible of misapprehension ; the blunder therefore of the Maccabean writer becomes in addition to the other evidences, an important testimony to the age and genuineness of the prophet’s writings : thus criticism far from proving as is affirmed, the non-authenticity of a great part of Daniel, throws its weight into the opposite scale. It shows the folly of those who, even in the case of one so learned and generally pious as Dr. Arnold, would be wise above that which is written in the unperishable revelations which the Almighty in His beneficent providence has vouchsafed to mankind.”—P. 409.

We must now close our notice of Mr. Boyle’s very exhaustive book. Its weakest point appears to us its attempt to fix historically several of the prophetic visions : we view all such endeavours with a wholesome distrust. The main strength of the book lies in the determination of the period of seventy weeks. We cannot touch this chronological fabric without handling the whole, and a proper examination of the question would far exceed our limits. We give Mr. Boyle’s conclusions :

"The generally received date of the Nativity (B.C. 5,) differing from that of S. Luke by two years, the very last mode apparently calculated to reconcile the Gospel narrative with actual chronology, was any addition to the years anterior to the Christian era, which should carry up the commencement of Herod's reign higher than B.C. 63; yet, the result of making this to begin one year earlier, has been the reverse of what might have been anticipated. Instead of raising the date of the Nativity in a corresponding ratio, so as to bring this up to B.C. 6, its effect in conjunction with other elements in the inquiry has been to lower the date of this great event to B.C. 3. Thus by means to all appearance utterly opposed to such a result has profane been brought into complete accordance with sacred chronology. It has further led to a solution of one of the most remarkable of the Old Testament prophecies, a prediction which for ages has baffled every attempt to establish an exegesis which would stand, and which from the confusion into which chronology had become involved, has long been regarded as hopelessly inexplicable. —P. 657.

We cannot help regretting that Mr. Boyle has not thrown his truly valuable researches into a more popular form. The reading of his book is a work of great difficulty and discomfort, and it is only the striking nature of his matter that redeems it from this drawback. The style is bald, unfinished, and cumbrous, consisting of long ill constructed sentences sadly deficient in both articles and pronouns. The chapters also are too long and too rambling, and should be broken up into a large number of well titled sections. The subject is necessarily a deep one, and to some minds rather uninviting in its aspect; it requires to be treated therefore in the most lucid way possible, and in the same simple style of composition that betrays such inherent power in the writings of Dr. Whewell and the late Professor Blunt. Should a second edition of this book be called for, we trust Mr. Boyle will somewhat remodel his materials, now that they are prepared all ready to his hand: we shall then follow him in the elucidation of the book of Daniel with infinitely more pleasure, and with a considerable diminution in our present toil. Let us not for a moment be misunderstood. Mr. Boyle's book is a good and a *true* book; the defects we have mentioned are but surface blemishes, and we thank him in the Church's name for so ably defending one of the most sublime books of the inspired canon.

PARISH VISITING.

THERE is, perhaps, speaking generally, no part of a parish priest's duty conducted on a less systematic plan or settled principle than what is commonly called "Visiting." The term itself is a very proper one, and has acquired somewhat of a technical meaning and authority from the usage of the Prayer Book in "the Order for the Visitation of the Sick." We understand what is meant by a Bishop's or Archdeacon's Visitation, and the Visitatorial powers belonging *ex officio* to these and certain other ecclesiastical dignitaries. But these uses of the word are well-defined, and imply a much more regular and formal function than we commonly intend when we speak of Parish Visiting. Still, even in this latter sense, the phrase has obtained such general acceptance as to have become almost technical, and would seem to involve some definite and stated practice grounded on certain principles of duty or right of jurisdiction. It may be worth while to ascertain, whether such is not theoretically the case, notwithstanding the prevailing discrepancy of practice.

The actual variety of purpose and practice in this matter differs indeed as widely and minutely as the difference of physical constitution, temperament, energy, habits, character, education, theological bias, personal religion of the individual clergy. Perhaps, the most ordinary type of Visiting is that taken up from the clergy and practised by the lay District Visitor or Scripture Reader, e.g., a gentle tap at the door, a gliding entrance, a smirking nod of recognition, a bland persuasiveness of tone; "How d'ye do, Mrs. Morris? I hope you are quite well to-day, ma'am;" a gradual worming oneself on to a vacant seat and into the good graces of the aged dame or other inmate, closing with the offer to read to her a chapter or to leave a tract. In the case of a more zealous witness of the Gospel, the Visit would be accompanied with a direct and intrusive examination into the spiritual experiences of the poor old body, and an unctuous exposition of the saving "view." In striking contrast with this is the blunt, bluff, free-and-easy, neighbourly, gossiping, jocose method, in which there is much small-talk of family affairs and all kinds of personal minutiae. "Ah! Mrs. Jinneway, hard at work washing to-day; how's Tom? how's baby? Has Bessy gone to service yet? What! keep a pig, do you? that's good; how much does he cost a week feeding? Billy wasn't at school yesterday! nor you, by the by, at the Sacrament last Sunday. Don't forget to send for some broth at the vicarage to-morrow," &c. &c. Another variety is that of the fussy, meddling, crotchety sort of parson,—of the detective-police or secret-inquisitor type,—prowling about like Haroun Alraschid or Paul Pry, at all sorts of odd unexpected hours, when people are off their guard, in quest

of parochial adventures, and loving to have a finger in everybody's pie. "Ah! Sarah Jane, I'm glad to have caught you at home just now; I want to ask you about your neighbours, the Jilkses; how are they going on? What time do they get up in the morning? what time did they come home last night? was Thomas sober? Have you ever heard that they were never really married? or anything else about them? Do you just keep an eye to them, Sarah; and let me know if anything goes wrong." Then lastly may be mentioned, the patronising, pompous, dictatorial, peremptory *genus clericorum*, called "prigs" (which Johnson well defines "pert, conceited, saucy, pragmatical little fellows,") ordering and scolding, or with cold polished courtesy tendering an alms, and laying down the law, *sic volo sic jubeo*, as to spending it. In short, almsgiving, gossiping, lecturing, supply the principal staple of ordinary Visiting. The above samples, with an endless variety of modification and combination, dependent on the temper, tact, degree of gentility or vulgarity of the individual pastor, will pretty nearly cover the whole area of parish-priest-craft. And this sort of thing, we imagine, is almost always intended when in an advertisement a desired or desiring curate is described as being "active in visiting the poor." To be active, bustling, gadding about from house to house, and talking with the people, especially whipping up men and women to church and children to school, is considered to be an essential and perhaps the most important part of his duty. If from taste, or habit, or conscientiousness, he is well up to the mark in this particular respect, he will find no difficulty in condoning much personal inefficiency in every other, and may safely reckon on an episcopal imprimatur as a *beau ideal* working clergyman.

For our own part, we consider the system to be altogether a mistake, and fraught with very serious evil consequences. It is almost always attended with great practical abuses. The Bible and private-homily method, first mentioned, has perhaps the most to say for itself as an attempt at direct pastoral instruction. But it is seldom better than useless, and very often positively mischievous in its effects. It fails to reach those who most need pastoral instruction,—the young, careless, and ungodly. Many are out at work all day, or are busy at home, and resent rudely or turn a cold shoulder to such visits, which dwindle down gradually to a select circle willing to accept them. They are perhaps harmless, and may be a comfort, in the case of the few extremely old and infirm religious folks who are to be found in every parish. These are bed-ridden or house-ridden, perhaps, and cannot get to church, and it helps to keep religion in their mind to have "a chapter" read to them occasionally at home. Only, there is no special virtue in the Bible or other religious book being read to them by *the clergyman himself*; a lay Visitor, male or female, would answer the purpose equally well; and, if so, it is simply a waste of precious time for the former

to make it a part of his regular occupation, when he might be engaged elsewhere in some more essential duties of his office. It almost always happens, indeed, that such poor people do get visited very constantly by kind neighbours, or regular District Visitors or Scripture Readers, whether under the direction of the local clergy, or intruders into the parish. We have an actual instance in our memory of a curate visiting and reading with one of his parishioners, and then discovering that the same thing had been done previously in the course of the afternoon, first by the vicar of the parish, then by a charitable lady who volunteered her services, then by a paid District Visitor, regularly employed, then by an itinerant diocesan Scripture Reader. To say nothing of the irksomeness and *ad nauseam* effect of these repeated (they may well be called) Visitations, there is no small risk that the ministration of the pastor himself may, in the minds of the people, get to be viewed on the same level and even placed in invidious rivalry with those of the other Visitors. He may come to be regarded as only a more gentlemanly kind of Scripture Reader, and by such comparisons very materially lose caste in his sacred and sacerdotal character.

Far more injurious in their consequences, and positively wrong and evil, are the other modes of Visiting above mentioned. If one wicked habit less than another will bear encouragement in most parishes, it is gossiping, tittle-tattle, back-biting, picking holes in the characters and conduct of one's neighbours. And this, we imagine, is not seldom fostered by the system of clerical *espionage* above referred to. It almost necessarily involves favouritism, jealousy, spitefulness, slander, quarrelling, and ill blood. It is demoralizing in the highest degree. Besides, the clergy simply have no more *right* to practise inquisitorialness and intrusion into private matters not concerning themselves, than other people. A poor man's home is as much his castle as the rich man's, and he as sensitively resents anything like prying into or meddling with his personal or family affairs. We have known a bustling busybody parson's Visitings quite stink in the nostrils of his parishioners through the offence taken at his officious interferences. And this offence has not seldom resulted in a total alienation from the Church, as the most feasible escape from liability to the odious surveillance. Even when the brusqueness and *bonhomie* of the pastor should conciliate the good-will of his people, and make him generally "liked," so that he seems to have gained considerable influence over them, his *dignity* is by these means often sacrificed to his *popularity*. Familiarity breeds contempt; and it is not easy with proper deference and respect to receive on the Sunday the awful or gracious messages of the Gospel from lips which have been babbling small-talk and twaddle through the week. *Gravity*, we consider, is an essential feature in the priestly character, and is necessary to encourage and secure confidential communications. Trifling and levity of any kind

is *infra dig.* "Let no man despise thy youth." We can perceive no good reason why this rule should not be as rigidly applied to modes of Parish Visiting, as to other functions of the priestly office.

Nothing that has been said is intended to disparage or cast a slur on Parish Visiting, properly understood. On the contrary, it was assumed, at the beginning of this article, that some right mode of Visiting was theoretically contemplated by the Church. A severe handling, however, is needed to clear away the prevailing *shams* which, under that name, are (in keeping with all the popular religious tendencies of the day) substituting the secular and carnal for the supernatural and sacramental. "Will you be ready," are the words of the Bishop in our Ordinal to candidates for the Priesthood, "to use both public and *private* monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within your Cures, as need shall require and occasion shall be given?" This plainly seems to indicate the particular mission and jurisdiction which may be supposed to find a proper exercise in what we have designated as parish Visiting. But, practically, what actual duties do the words imply? It is remarkable, in the first place, that the injunction is limited to the Priesthood; and it appears, on the other hand, from the Ordinal, that it is *not* a part of the Priest's Office, but the Deacon's, "to *search* for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, and to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell, unto the Curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners, or others." Then, the fact that "private" and "public," "whole" and "sick" are put on the same level in this passage, and that a particular "need" and "occasion" are referred to, and the very use of such imposing terms as "monition" and "exhortation;" all this is noteworthy, and seems to infer a far graver and more stated ministration than is commonly imagined. The duty enjoined in the Ordination precept is to be done as by one having authority as a Parish Priest. It is not a mere neighbourly and charitable act of kindness; it is a part of the *Officium Sacerdotale*. The Priesthood must be the central and dominant idea in all *true* theories of parish visiting.

This alone is a sufficient ground for reprobating the practices generally followed. They tend to confound the supernatural grace and efficacy of Holy Orders with the personal ability and energy of the individual Priest. He is something more surely than an educated gentleman, using such influence as his independent means and superior station give him over his people, to make his parish a model of order and respectability. He is something more than a clerical Squire and Justice of the Peace. His one great work and all-absorbing purpose towards them is *the salvation of their souls, their edification in spiritual-mindedness and sanctity*. All his private, no less than his public, intercourse and conversation with them should be directed to this end. It is of the first importance that both Priest

and people should have a clear and settled understanding on this point. They should habitually learn to interpret all the actions of his life as having reference to their welfare, not in this world, but in the world to come. And this object is scarcely attainable by the random, helter-skelter sort of Visiting to which we have adverted. How often may we hear the confession of an earnest, painstaking, and experienced Priest, that, notwithstanding all the apparent success of his activity, he cannot make his people *religious, devotional, spiritual, unworldly* ! His whole parish outwardly is well-conducted ; the people come to Church pretty regularly on Sundays ; the schools are efficient and well attended ; but there are still lacking symptoms of that deeper life of faith in the soul, without which mere moral decency and respectability are little worth. The probable explanation is that his pastoral ministrations have not been sufficiently *restricted* to this end. He has been carried along with the stream of popular religious tendencies, and trusted too much to his own personal activity and zeal. The first great care, one may add, the only special obligation of the Parish Priest, is to discharge his *sacerdotal* functions duly, fully, and as efficiently as possible. These consist, of course, principally of his Ministry of the Word and Sacraments ; a discreet and scrupulous exercise of the Power of the Keys ; a constant observance of all ritual proprieties ; attention to all the nice details of the Church and Services.

It is sometimes argued glibly, that "an active visiting from house to house is worth all the Church-services and sermonizing in the world." The converse probably is nearer to the truth, that nothing more tends to neutralize the effect of public ministrations than parish Visiting conducted in the manner above described. Whatever lowers the *spiritual* character of the Pastor takes off so much weight and force from the moral influence of his Office. It is simple unbelief in the efficacy of Sacraments, prayers, and intercessions, that postpones Church Services for any out-of-door work. And next to his public ministrations, may be reckoned the Priest's private *intercession* for his people ; and this not only of course in general terms, but with a minute particularization of individual parishioners, and of the religious institutions of the parish. Then, in our opinion, not nearly sufficient time and thought is, speaking generally, allotted by the Clergy to theological study and the preparation of sermons. The inefficiency of modern preaching is, perhaps, chiefly owing to this cause. We are not now speaking of style of composition. Not nearly sufficient care is commonly given to thinking over topics and modes of handling them in a way most likely to arouse the listless, convert the ungodly, deepen the religious impressions and spiritual-mindedness of the well-inclined, with reference to particular parishioners. The time which might be so spent is not uncommonly grudged and stinted, as so much taken away from the more *ad captandum* and tangible effects of out-

of-door Visiting. It must be briefly noted, too, that some fair portion of the time, meditations, and literary labours of the Priest are justly due, not to his parishioners only, but to the Church of his Diocese, and to the National and Catholic Church; of which no less truly than of his own particular parish, he is the sworn and responsible Priest. Of his out-of-door proper avocations, schools probably have the first claim to regular attention. Here, again, he must be careful to preserve a constant recollection that his proper relation towards them is that of the Parish Priest; and he would wisely do nothing, in the way of teaching or otherwise, not in strict keeping with his Office. Prayers at the opening and closing of the school hours, catechetical instruction, lessons in Holy Scripture, and spiritual advice to the children, individualized as far as practicable, will afford an ample field of duty in this particular department. The same may be said of any other Church Institutions in the parish. And this brings us to the almost only remaining duty of Visiting, whether the sick or whole, at home, the subject more immediately under present consideration.

All that has been said and remains yet to be said in this article, it should be noticed, contemplates the pastoral alone as distinct from the *missionary* office. In very many parishes, certainly there is no end of missionary work also to be accomplished; but that is beside the present question. We are now considering the case of a Priest put in charge of an ordinary parish, whether town or country, being such as the Prayer Book speaks of as a "Curate," and the Ecclesiastical law as a "Parson." A quite distinct agency is required for Missionary work. Already, a considerable portion of his every-day life both in Church and at home, has been theoretically provided with employment in the discharge of regular official functions. A good deal of the work also intended in parish Visiting may be carried on at home; an hour or more, according to circumstances, might well be set apart every day, when it should be known that he would be always accessible to any parishioners desiring to converse with him privately, in the vestry or other convenient place. A certain time in the morning, and a certain time after working hours for this purpose, might be conveniently appointed. Then, he could *regularly* have classes at home of catechumens, candidates for confirmation, communicants, Sunday school teachers, district visitors, and others. These latter, being male and female under his direction, would be his chief agency in Missionary work, in house-to-house Visiting, in beating up children to school, in reading to the sick and house-ridden, in distributing tracts, alms, medical comforts, and the like; in the management of lending libraries, clothing clubs, savings banks, and other charitable institutions; in short, in all the sundry duties of the Diaconate, so far as lay-agency can perform them. Every possible care of course ought to be taken to ensure regularity, order, and efficiency in the work-

ing out of this system, and a check put upon the natural tendency to frittering away of time, busy-bodyism and tittle-tattle such as was above deprecated, and all the scandal and demoralizing abuses to which the very best considered plans for parochial work are liable. Reports "to the Curate" of special cases requiring his personal interference, would constantly supply instances of the particular "need and occasion" contemplated in the above-quoted precept of the Ordinal. Monitions and exhortations, censures, and inhibitions from Holy Communion, would have to be administered by him in cases of notorious sin; quarrels among neighbours to be reconciled; scruples of conscience to be pacified; avowed heresy or infidelity to be gainsaid. These are specimens of a class of subjects demanding special Visitation. But the advantage generally of his *individualizing* parishioners, cannot be insisted on with too much stress. He will "*watch* for their souls" singly, and deal with them accordingly, "as need shall require, and occasion shall be given."

The Shepherd and the Physician are the Divine images of the Christian pastor; the objects of his chief direct attention will be the exceptional and the few. He will leave the ninety-nine comparatively uncared for in the wilderness, to concentrate for the time his best skill and energy on any "one" that seems more peculiarly to need it. The *sick* souls, and not the whole among his people, will engage his tenderest treatment and most assiduous care.

And this rule of discrimination should be applied equally to the sick in body. In both cases alike, his visits should partake of the nature of a Priestly ministration. Sisters, or less regular District Visitors would suffice for the little ministries of charity, and for Scripture or other religious readings, on some stated plan under his direction; but his own occasional visits should be broadly distinguished by a marked and formal character, and accompanied always by some sacerdotal act: the proper salutation on entering the house, the benediction of its members on leaving, or the Blessed Sacrament. The Order for the Visitation, which is to be used once only, may be taken to indicate the intentions of the English Church, as regards the practice of the Parish Priest in Visiting the sick. Many among us, on the strength of Scriptural authority interpreted by the Church's practice, have desired, and some, we believe, have administered *Unction* of the sick. In all private ministrations, it need scarcely be said, the proper sacerdotal vestments should be used; and great care taken in the proper arrangement of Private Communion and Baptism.

Thus much then will explain the *principle* of our theory of Parish Visiting. We must leave our clerical readers to work out its details, with whatever amplification or modification their own experience may suggest. We sincerely wish that some of those who agree with us in condemning the extremely injurious tendency of the prevailing system in this matter, would bring the subject forward in *ruditecanal*

or other like re-unions of the clergy, where such questions are discussed. There are many who have instinctively felt the degradation and disagreeableness of their present system, who yet perhaps, not discovering the true principle involved, have conscientiously forced themselves to follow it in the faith of unseen blessing attending on their labours. It is hoped they may be induced to consider the whole subject, from the point of view opened to them in this article; and so far as opportunity is given them, to remodel their Parish Visiting on a new and holier plan.

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE SCOTCH LITURGY.

Communion Office for the use of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.
Aberdeen: John Wilson, 1863.

WHEN measures were being taken for the repeal of those Penal Statutes which pressed so heavily on the Church of Scotland from 1748 to 1792, the Scotch Bishops, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, bore witness that they were in full Communion with the Church of England.

"The Book of Common Prayer," said they, "we believe in our hearts, to be the best composed Liturgy in the world. The Morning and Evening Service, as read in that book, we constantly make use of; and though we generally use the Scottish Communion Office, nearly as authorised by Charles I., yet so far are we from making this usage a condition of Communion, that our own clergy have a discretionary power to use which of the two offices they please, and some of them do actually make use of the English Office." (Skinner's Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, p. 97.)

The English Bishops, perceiving that the Scotch Church, although reduced to the lowest ebb, in a temporal point of view, was yet "the Catholic Remainder" of the ancient National Church of Scotland—insignificant as to numbers, but independent and entire as a provincial branch of the Church Catholic, espoused her cause with becoming interest, and some of them with the greatest warmth and energy. Amongst the foremost of these, was Dr. Horsley, then Bishop of S. David's. This prelate set himself to investigate the point of difference between the Anglican and Scottish branches of the Church to which the memorialists had referred, viz., the Communion Office; he carefully collated the offices of "King Edward VIth's Prayer Book, the old Scotch Prayer Book, the present English Prayer Book, and the present Scotch Communion Office," and his testimony in favour of the orthodoxy and

superior excellence of the Scotch Office, is on record. In a letter to the Rev. John Skinner, of Forfar, of date June 17, 1806, he says,—

“With respect to the comparative merit of the two Communion Offices for England and Scotland, I have no scruple in declaring that I think the Scottish Office more conformable to the primitive models, and, in my private judgment, more edifying than the English Office now in use, insomuch that, were I at liberty to follow my own private judgment, I would myself use the Scottish Office in preference.” (See Skinner’s *Annals*, p. 439.)

But the point to which we would especially call attention is,—that the office, as thus collated by Bishop Horsley, is the authorized version of the Scotch Communion Office, submitted to the English Prelates, and through them to the British Parliament, by the Scotch Bishops, when petitioning for a repeal of those laws which injuriously affected their branch of the Church. The following attestation is preserved along with the collated offices, by Mr. Skinner, in an appendix to his well known “*Dissertation*.”

“That the Liturgy now in use among the Scotch Episcopalians, is precisely the same with the present Common Prayer Book of the Established Church of England, except in the Communion Office; and that the variations found there are those, and those only, which are exhibited in this collation, is attested by, John Skinner, Bishop and delegate of the Scotch Episcopal Church. London, March 30th, 1792.”

It is rather remarkable that, with the exception of an edition published in what is commonly known as Bishop Torry’s Prayer Book, no complete version of the office, as collated by Bishop Horsley and attested by Bishop Skinner, has ever been given to the public, till now that Mr. Wilson has supplied the defect. Imperfect editions there have been without number, but now, for the first time, we have the Office entire and accurate. The only things now wanting to make it all that one could desire, are the Rubrics and the two Exhortations, “when the Minister giveth warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion,” and the Rubric and Collects at the end of the Office, “to be said after the sermon when there is no Communion,” &c. These are not included in Bishop Horsley’s collated office, and therefore, as we conclude, have been omitted by Mr. Wilson, in the edition just published. We think this a mistake. The exhortations were probably not collated by Bishop Horsley, because, in 1792, they were only partially in use. Every Bishop, and indeed every Presbyter, then used an exhortation, differing more or less from that in the English Prayer Book; and it was not till after the General Synod of 1811, that strict uniformity in the use of the exhortations, was enjoined. But as they may be said to have formed an integral portion of the national

Scotch office ever since that time, we think that, in all future editions of the Office, they ought to be included. The same remark holds good with respect to the Rubric and Collects at the end of the Office. Why these do not appear in Dr. Horsley's collated copy, we are unable to say; but this far we, on the best authority, can affirm, that they were in use before the Scotch General Synod of 1811, exactly as they have been since, and therefore, although not forming an integral part of the Scotch, any more than they form an integral part of the English Office, they are entitled to a place in every edition claiming to be full and complete.

The Scotch Liturgy, it is well known, was brought to its present form about a century ago. In use, however, it had been substantially the same from the times of Gadderer, Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith—the printed editions, where they differed from the present form, being corrected or supplemented by the pen. That the form in use in the diocese of Aberdeen, was held to be the standard copy, we gather from a letter, of date November 28, 1743, from the Rev. Robert Lyon, who suffered death at Carlisle for his attachment to the Stuarts, to Bishop Alexander: he says,—

“The majority, who use the Scotch Liturgy, is so great, that they are now but very few who do otherwise, and these few in the southern parts mostly, overawed by some ignorant laity. All in this district (diocese of Dunkeld) are unanimous in the Scotch, except myself, who, not of inclination, but for reasons too well known, was obliged to comply with borrowing only the Invocation and Oblation from the Scotch. All in Bishop Raitt's district, (Brechin,) use the Scotch Communion Office likewise, except two; but whether these two transpose the oblatory prayer or not, I cannot tell; but sure I am, Bishop Ochterlonie himself did so. I am likewise sure that the greatest part of the Presbyters in Fife, if not all, do use the Scotch; and besides, the most of all these clergy use it in its natural order, according to the edition printed at Aberdeen. It is also well known, and without doubt to yourself, that there is not one single Presbyterian benorth the Mearns, who does not officiate by the Scotch; so that those who use the English, or who transpose the Oblatory Prayer, though joined together, are few, yea, very few, upon the comparison. And I am persuaded, the most of the clergy of my acquaintance, and with great sincerity I can say it of myself, would much sooner *resign* our several charges, than *give up* the Scotch to use the English Communion Office; yea, the greatest number even of our laity, would desert us, should we attempt it.” (History of the Church of Scotland, by Thomas Stephen, Vol. IV. p. 300.)

We can, therefore, have no doubt as to the great and general attachment of the members of the Scottish Church, to their national Liturgy, about the middle of the last century. Nor was this attachment unreasonable. The Scotch Office was peculiarly excellent, because of its close adherence to the primitive models, especially to that of S. James of Jerusalem, and it had, and has, this additional

claim on the respect and support of all who would rejoice in the re-union of Catholic Christendom, in that it supplies common ground on which the east and west could meet. It contains all that the Eastern Church holds necessary to a valid consecration of the elements, and it has nothing in it at variance with the great principle recognised by the reformed branches of the Western Church—"The Canon of inspired Scripture, as understood and interpreted by the early Catholic Church." As the Scotch branch of the Church is now canonically in full communion with the Anglican, it follows that the Anglican might, on the ground of the Scotch Liturgy which it thus indirectly recognises, enter on negotiations with "the holy Eastern Church," for a restoration of full intercommunion.

The Scotch Church has thus a treasure in its Eucharistic Liturgy, which, more than any thing else, gives it a place and a name among the Churches of Christendom; indeed it has little else to attract either notice or admiration. Its numbers are small; its missionary exertions are *nil*; its energies are not remarkable. The zeal of its members is any thing but warm; the learning of its clergy is not such as to command the wonderment of the age. The chief, the only objects by which it has long commanded the notice and respect of all who have a real regard for Catholic truth, are—its Eucharistic Liturgy, and its professed adherence, in all things, to the great Canon already mentioned—Holy Scripture, interpreted by Catholic antiquity. Take away its Liturgy, and it will soon lose its name; diminish its respect for Catholic tradition, and it will soon become little else than a mere denominational sect, seeking strength in the number of its adherents, rather than in the Catholicity of its principles, or the intelligence of its members. We therefore welcome this new edition of the Scotch Liturgy as an augury of an approaching revival of the spirit of the Church in that land, and of the development of some especial purpose for which, as it would seem, she has been providentially preserved amid so many trials and discouragements.

From the same publisher we have some "Short Instructions" with a "Rationale of Postures" which we doubt not will be useful in Scotland. It is an error nevertheless to direct persons to stand at the *Ter-Sanctus* and to teach them to join in the words "Therefore with angels," &c.

THE DECLARATION ON KNEELING.

Some Historical Considerations relating to the Declaration on Kneeling, appended to the Communion Office of the English Book of Common Prayer. A Letter addressed privately in 1858 to the Right Rev. Charles H. Terrot, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh, and then Primus. To which is added a Postscript of further authorities and arguments, including an Examination of Statements in a Work and Supplement on the Eucharist, by the Very Rev. W. Goode, D.D., Dean of Ripon. By the Rev. THOMAS WALTER PERRY, Assistant Curate of S. Michael and All Angels, Brighton. London : Masters.

CONTROVERSIES, like all commotions, have their use. As storms clear the air and disperse unwholesome vapours, so controversies, undesirable as they are in themselves, sharpen men's faculties and promote industry in the prosecution of historical inquiries. At times when controversies have been laid at rest, in the absence of real subjects of debate, recourse has been had to dialectic sham fights for the cultivation of the critical acumen.

The acts and opponencies of the Schools are a relic of bygone days, when controversies had to be invented for this purpose. In our own days we have found materials for discussion all too ready to our hands, without the necessity of having recourse to scholastic subtleties. The cause we deplore, for the existence of heresies and strifes must always be a grief to the disciples of Him, Who was the Prince of Peace; and yet the effect may, on the whole, have been beneficial to the Church, since, whilst by exercise controversialists have acquired skill in defending the principles of the Christian Faith, many of us have learnt to love more entirely and to appreciate more deeply the truths which are asserted. Even if bitterness of feeling is sometimes called forth amidst the heat of religious controversy—and this we must acknowledge to be a sin against charity—yet the evil has a natural tendency to subside and leave a residuum of good behind. And when the cause is just and right, the good is not confined to those who have taken part in the discussion, for it leads others to examine truths with a greater interest than before, and to uncover depths of learning which they would never else have penetrated. By discussion Christian truth will therefore in the end be the gainer, even though the combatants themselves may suffer for a while through diminution of their peace and love.

The Eucharistic controversy has certainly been an evidence of this. More reverent views of the Sacrament of the LORD'S Body and Blood have fixed themselves on men's minds, whilst their

attention was being attracted to the disputes which were raised concerning it; and more than this, the inquiry involved a search into historic records which might otherwise have remained covered over with the dust of ages. Mr. Perry's book, to which this present article is devoted, is the product of the Eucharistic controversy. As a matter of mere antiquarian interest he could not have had the same inducement to diligent and patient investigation into the question of which he treats, as the Eucharistic controversy supplied; but now, in that which he has done, he has contributed a valuable addition to our theological literature, by collecting together the opinions of the Reformers as the truest exposition of a rubric, which has not only hitherto been often misunderstood, but has proved a rock of offence and a stumbling-block to many.

The Declaration appended to the Communion Office appeared to be a denial of the Real Presence of our SAVIOUR in the Eucharist. The objection was often urged against the Office itself on the one hand, whilst on the other it was used as an argument to prove that the doctrine of the Real Presence was not countenanced by the Prayer Book. Mr. Perry has, however, dispelled both the argument and the objection by proving that the framers of the declaration, as it originally stood, did not intend to deny the doctrine, but only to defend it from misapprehension, and that in its present form it is no less than an assertion of the Real Presence. The opinions of the framers of the rubric, elsewhere expressed about the same time, must be the fairest exposition of the sense which they intended it to bear. Even a writer, so learned and investigating as Dr. Pusey, had supposed, that it was composed at a time when our English Reformers had adopted from continental divines a lower tone of sacramental doctrine, and that the rubric omitted in Queen Elizabeth's Book was altered in form, when it was again restored to its place, to suit the higher doctrine of the Caroline divines.

"They who first framed the sentence moulded it carefully to exclude the Real Presence altogether. Happily what authority they had came from the State, not from the Church, and so the early death of Edward VI. cut short their work. But they framed the words effectually for their purpose to exclude any '*real or essential Presence*.' 'No adoration,' they said, 'is intended or ought to be done unto any *real or essential Presence* of CHRIST's natural Flesh and Blood. The reformers of the rubric carefully expunged the words '*real and essential*' and substituted the word '*corporal*.' It is a mere paradox to say that the framers and reformers of the rubric meant the same thing; and that, while its reformers deliberately rejected what its framers deliberately inserted, it is all one as if they had not rejected it, and substituted another word."¹

To show the identity of the two rubrics is nevertheless a work

¹ Pusey on the Real Presence, 322.

of great importance on account of the reverence which members of the English Church commonly pay to the memories of Cranmer and Ridley. If they denied the Real Presence, the subsequent alteration of the words of the rubric would not prevent men from claiming a right to disbelieve that which they denied, and therefore the aim of Mr. Perry's work is to remove this ground of support. To show the manner in which this is done we will follow, as briefly as we can, the course of Mr. Perry's argument, a task in which we are greatly assisted by the admirable analysis which we find at the end of the book.

It is necessary, first, to show what the doctrine really was which the reformers intended to exclude. This doctrine was the carnal or Capernaical belief in the Real Presence which extensively prevailed amongst clergy and laity in the middle of the sixteenth century. That this belief was prevalent and held even by Henry VIII. appears, amongst other proofs, from the condemnation of Nicholas Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury in 1546, for denying that CHRIST's *natural* Body was in the Eucharist. Bishop Shaxton however escaped the stake by a recantation, in which he declared that he did with his heart believe that "Almighty God, by the power of His worde pronounced by the priest at Masse in the consecration, turneth the breade and wyne into the *very natural* Body and Blood of oure SAVIOUR JHESU CRYSTE. Soo that after the consecration there remayneth noo substaunce of breadde and wyne, but onely the substaunce of CRYSTE, God and man."—P. 5.

To meet this carnal opinion in an Act passed in the first year of Edward VI., c. 1., entitled "An Act against such as shall irreverently speak of the Sacrament of the Altar, and of the receiv- ing thereof in both kinds," all persons are prohibited from open controversy and strife on the subject, and from "affirming any more terms of the said Blessed Sacrament than be expressly taught in the Holy Scripture, and mentioned in the aforesaid Act" until authority shall "define, declare, and set forth an open doctrine thereof, and what terms and words may justly be spoken thereby, other than be expressly in the Scripture contained, in the Act before rehearsed."—P. 6.

Now as this belief mainly, though not entirely, resulted from the popular doctrine of Transubstantiation, so a continuous effort was made to suppress that doctrine. Disputations were accordingly held at Oxford and Cambridge, in the year 1549, at the latter of which Perne said, "I grant unto you that CHRIST is in the Sacrament *truly, wholly, and verily* after a certain property and manner. I deny not *His Presence*, but *His real and corporeal Presence* I utterly deny, for doubtless His *true* and natural Body is in heaven, and not in the Sacrament; notwithstanding He dwelleth with us, and in us, after a certain unity." (P. 18.) Subsequently to these disputations, Ridley put forth a "Determination,"

in which he disproved Transubstantiation on this amongst other grounds. "They who say that CHRIST is carnally present, do take from Him the verity of man's nature." (P. 19.) Nevertheless, whilst the *carnal* Presence was denied, there was no intention to discourage a belief in the real objective Presence of CHRIST in the ministration of the Sacrament, or under the form of bread and wine, if such presence was not held to be natural or organical.

The Real Presence does not necessarily involve Transubstantiation. We believe the doctrine, whilst we reject the explanation which the Church of Rome has invented. This has nowhere been better stated than by Dr. Pusey, in his celebrated letter to the late Bishop of London.

"I have never," says Dr. Pusey, "taught any thing physical, corporeal, carnal, but spiritual, sacramental, divine, ineffable, and when I have said, as I could not but acknowledge, that I could not see how the Roman Catholics could mean less by the accidents of bread and wine, than we of the substance; this was not to draw our doctrine to theirs, but theirs to ours. If it be granted, as they must grant, that all the natural properties remain, size, form, solidity, the same distribution of particles, whereof the elements are composed, the same natural powers of nourishment and exhilaration, the same effect upon the nervous system, and every other physical property, I do not know what remains, which we mean to affirm and they to deny. But I have said this, not as adopting their mode of explanation, which is not acknowledged by the Greek Church any more than by our own, but as hoping that our differences were not irreconcilable, and that we are condemning a popular physical interpretation, which they cannot consistently hold. I mention this, because I have acknowledged this when consulted. I have said that it appears from our Article itself, that it condemns Transubstantiation, in the sense of implying a physical change. This appears from the words, 'is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture,' i.e., in that it entitles the consecrated element, 'bread,' 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,' in that a Sacrament is 'a sign of a sacred thing,' and on this view the sign would be the thing itself. If any imply not a physical change, the Article does not apply to them."¹

This language is consonant, as we shall see, with what the Reformers held and taught during the reign of Edward VI. It is well known that Cranmer's opinions underwent some change during this time, and it has been often asserted, that the result of this change was an entire abandonment of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the Rubric in question has been quoted as an evidence of this. Now Mr. Perry proves from the evidence of his own writings, that whilst Cranmer successively gave up the popular Capernaite belief, in which he had been educated, and the more scholastic theory of Transubstantiation, he held to the very end of his life, the doctrine of the real objective Presence of CHRIST in the Sacrament. In

¹ Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London, p. 69, 70.

1551, one year only before the publication of King Edward's second book, the Archbishop thus writes.

"... As He giveth the bread to be eaten with our mouths, so giveth He His *very* Body to be eaten with our faith. And therefore I say, CHRIST giveth Himself *truly* to be eaten, chewed and digested; but all is *spiritually* with faith, not with *mouth*; and yet you would bear me in hand that I say that thing which I say not; that is to say, that CHRIST did not give His Body, but the figure of His Body.

"And therefore to answer you plainly, the *same* flesh, that was given in CHRIST's last Supper, was given also upon the Cross, and is given daily in the ministration of the Sacrament. But although it be *one* thing, yet it was *diversely* given; for upon the Cross CHRIST was *carnally* given to suffer and to die. At His last supper, He was *spiritually* given in a promise of His death; and in the Sacrament He is daily given in *remembrance* of His death. And yet it is all one, CHRIST that was promised to die, that died indeed, and whose death is remembered, that is to say, the *very same* CHRIST, the Eternal Word that was made flesh."—P. 20, 21.

Ridley's opinion—and Ridley's opinion had great weight with Cranmer—even at a later period, is on record, for in his examination at Oxford, September 30, 1555, he says,—

"Always, my protestation reserved, I answer thus; that in the Sacrament is a certain change, in that, that bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of CHRIST's Body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth His Body, that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of CHRIST's Body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. *Such a Sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine*, which truly is no small change, but such a change as no mortal man can make, but *only* the Omnipotency of CHRIST's Word."¹

Mr. Perry's next position is, that the doctrine of the Real Presence was authoritatively taught in 1549, and during the rest of the reign of Edward VI. That the first book was such as the unreforming party could use, may be gathered from a letter from the Duke of Somerset, still extant in the State Paper Office, bearing date June 4, 1549, accompanying a copy of the new book, which the Duke sent to Cardinal Pole, requesting his opinion respecting it. It was in 1549, that the disputations, to which reference has already been made, were held at Oxford and Cambridge, and it is evident that the intention was only to controvert the Capernaite theory, while the Real Objective Presence was maintained throughout. When in 1551, Gardiner was in trouble respecting his teaching on the Holy Communion, his defence was, that Ridley, Redman, and Cranmer, citing instances of each, had taught the *true* presence

¹ Foxe, VII. 528.

of CHRIST's Body in the Sacrament of the altar, as distinctly as he had done himself.

In 1552, the Articles and the New Prayer Book were issued. In the 28th of the XLII. Articles, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was denied, but no positive affirmation was made respecting the nature of CHRIST's presence in the Sacrament. From this we may conclude, that no change in doctrine was intended, but that what had been taught before, should be taught still. Coeval with these Articles, appeared the second Prayer Book of Edward VI., but no change in doctrine was thereby intended. This much the Act of Uniformity declared, which spoke of the former book as "A very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God, and to the Primitive Church; very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm." We have likewise the testimony of Latimer, that no alteration of doctrine was intended, for in his examination at Oxford, in 1554, he says, in reference to the two books, "I find no great diversity in them; they are one supper of the LORD, but I like the last very well." We must remember also, that it was the same book, with only a few alterations, which was in use during the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign, and which not only satisfied the Roman party, but would have received the Papal sanction, as we have good reason to believe, if the Queen had chosen to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. The Dean of Ripon has endeavoured to prove that the differences between the first and second books of Edward VI. manifest an entire change of Sacramental doctrine. But we must leave our readers to decide between the credibility of two witnesses, Latimer, who testifies that the doctrine taught in both books is identical, and Dean Goode, who asserts that they are contradictory.

And now we come to the reasons for the introduction of the declaration at the end of the Communion office, which had not existed in the previous book. The conclusion is thus stated by Mr. Perry:

"When in 1552 objections were made to that rubric, which enjoined kneeling at reception of the Sacrament, the declaration containing it was framed in conformity with the considerations advanced in the foregoing positions, and that consequently the words *real* and *essential* were not meant to be a denial of the real objective Presence of CHRIST in the Eucharist."

In the former book, no direction with respect to kneeling was necessary, because it was presumed that no one would think of receiving it in any other posture. Before the publication of the second book the tide of Puritanism had begun to set in, and it was under this pressure that such immaterial alterations were made in the services, as might allay the prejudice of Puritan objectors without touching doctrine. Amongst other things, objections had been made to kneeling at the reception, and therefore it was

now thought necessary to add a distinct rubric enjoining it, lest anyone, taking advantage of the silence of the Church, should claim the right of receiving in a standing or a sitting posture. The declaration at the end of the Communion office was not contained in the book, as it was settled by Convocation and authorized by statute, and many copies were apparently printed without it; for it was not until the 27th of October, 1552,—*only four days* before the Feast of All Saints, the day on which its use was to commence, that a letter was written from the Council to the Lord Chancellor—to add in the edition of the new Common Prayer Book a declaration, touching kneeling at the receiving of the Communion; and the reason of this addition without the authority either of Convocation or Parliament, appears to have been objections which were made to the Council against the order to kneel. First we have a letter from Cranmer to the council, dated October 7th, 1552, in defence of kneeling, which proves that some circumstances had rendered such a defence needful. Some influential person had been busy with the Council, and Cranmer appears to have been fearful lest he should succeed in his endeavour to induce the Council to withdraw the rubric, which directed communicants to kneel. There is great reason to suppose that this objector was no less a person than the celebrated John Knox, who had been appointed one of the six royal chaplains, in December, 1551. We learn from Strype that he was appointed in *October*, 1552, to revise the Articles then in preparation. The fact that he was in London in the month of October is therefore established. In a letter from John Utenhovius to Henry Bullinger, dated London, October 12th, 1552, the following passage occurs:

“Some disputes have arisen within these few days among the Bishops in consequence of a sermon of a pious preacher, chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland, preached by him before the King and Council, in which he inveighed with great freedom against kneeling at the Lord's Supper, which is still retained here in England. This good man, however, a Scotsman by nation, has so wrought upon the minds of many persons, that we may hope some good to the Church will at length arise from it; which I earnestly implore the LORD to grant.”¹

That this “Scotsman by nation” was Knox may reasonably be inferred, since his office of Royal chaplain would account for his preaching before the King, and he may very probably have been chaplain to the Duke of Northumberland, who was his friend and patron, previously to his promotion, of which Utenhovius may have been ignorant. Another piece of confirmatory evidence is furnished by a line of “memoranda of matters to be brought before the Council,” dated October 20, which has been found in the State Paper Office.

“Mr. Knocks—B of Cant^{re}—y^e book on y^t (or y^e) B. of Durh.”

¹ Original Letters, Parker Society, p. 591.

What this means it is impossible to decide, but the juxtaposition of the names of Knox and Craumer, and the fact that the memorandum is dated just seven days before the letter was issued to the Lord Chancellor to add the declaration, renders it by no means improbable that the matter referred to the dispute on kneeling, which appears, from the evidence which has been brought forward, to have excited great attention at this time. It seems probable, therefore, that under this pressure the Archbishop was directed to have recourse to some measure which might meet the difficulty. He was placed in no easy position, as All Saints' Day was fast approaching, and there was no time for proceeding either in Convocation or in Parliament. He, therefore, resorted to the expedient of introducing at the end of the Communion office, a statement borrowed from the XXVIII. article, which had lately received the authority both of Convocation and of Parliament, to show the Puritans that they might safely kneel, as no adoration was thereby intended to any carnal presence of our LORD.

So the matter rested during the remainder of Edward's reign. The time during which the reformed Prayer Book was in abeyance we may pass over, and go on to the accession of Elizabeth. The Queen proceeded with the utmost caution, as she had many minds to satisfy; and the changes made in the Prayer Book were therefore made with a view to comprehension. Amongst other alterations, the declaration on kneeling disappeared from the end of the Communion office; since, as Bishop Burnet says, it might have given offence to some, otherwise inclinable to the communion of the Church, who yet retained the belief of the Corporal Presence.¹

Collier suggests the same reason for the omission, but Mr. Harold Brown supposes that the declaration, as well as the corresponding clause in the XXVIII. article, was left out from a wish not to offend the many persons of Lutheran sentiments then in communion with the Church. Comprehension, as far as possible, was at any rate the order of the day. Amongst questions proposed by Cecil to Guest, it was asked, "whether the Sacrament was to be received standing or kneeling?" Guest thought it might be left indifferent, but this opinion was never acted on. If it had been, it would not, however, have involved any denial of the Real Presence, since standing was the external form of devotion in the Greek Church both in prayer and in receiving the sacred elements. Nothing, moreover, is proved by the omission, and no reflection is cast on the declaration as implying the denial of a doctrine which the Elizabethan divines received.

Meanwhile, the recognition of the doctrine of the Real Presence was not withdrawn, but was supported by such Eucharistic documents and statements as were set forth by ecclesiastical authority from the time of Elizabeth till the Restoration. First we have the

¹ Hist. Ref.—Pt. II. Bk. 1.

XXVIII. Article as explained in Bishop Guest's now celebrated letter. Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester, had objected that the words of the Article, "The Body and Blood of CHRIST is taken and eaten in the Supper after a heavenly and spiritual manner *only*," took away the presence of CHRIST's Body in the Sacrament. Guest, who had framed the Article, answered that it did not exclude the presence of CHRIST's Body in the Sacrament, but only "the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." The discovery of this letter occurred at a most opportune time during the recent period of controversy; but Dean Goode was not to be outdone by those whom he assailed. He therefore searched the State Paper Office and found another letter to Cecil, probably written by Guest, dated May, 1571, in which he thought he discovered sentiments at variance with those expressed in the former letter, but really when the whole letter is examined, it is difficult to find out the inconsistency. The following passage alludes to the circumstance mentioned in the first letter:

"In that, in ye booke it is further said after a spirituall and heavenly maner onely, some be offended withe this worde onely, as my Lord of Gloucester, as though this worde onely did take awaye ye reall presence of CHRISTIS bodye, or ye receiuinge of ye same by ye mouthe, whereas it was putt in onely to this ende, to take away all grosse and sensible presence, for it is very true that when CHRISTIS bodye is taken and eaten, it is neither seen, felt, smelt nor tasted to be CHRISTIS bodye, and so it is received and eaten, but after a heavenly and spirituall and no sensible manner."—P. 199.

We are not concerned to defend Bishop Guest's memory from the Dean of Ripon's insinuations, as we are now considering a question of fact which is independent of the Bishop's personal character.

The restoration of the original words in the delivery of the elements is another evidence of the belief of the Elizabethan Divines in a real objective presence, and so also is Bishop Overall's addition to the Church Catechism, which was made in the reign of James I. The Irish Articles, moreover, agreed on in Convocation at Dublin, 1615, state that "in the inward and spiritual part, the same Body and Blood is *really* and *substantially* presented unto all those who have grace to receive the SON of GOD, even to all those that believe in His Name."

And now we come to the restoration of the Declaration when the order of the Holy Communion was reviewed. The known opinions of the leading reviewers and the circumstances connected with the restoration of the Declaration all concur to prove a continued acceptance of the doctrine of the Real Presence. The Puritans had now again renewed their objections to kneeling. Amongst the exceptions made by the Puritan party at the Savoy

Conference was one desiring that the posture should be left indifferent, and also that the declaration should be restored. The Bishops answered that the posture of kneeling was most fitting as being *more adorantium*—a noteworthy expression;—and that the rubric was not in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, and had never been confirmed by law; and that there was no need of it since the sense of it was sufficiently declared in the XXVIII. Article. The declaration, however, was inserted, but lest it should be misunderstood, the words “real and *essential* presence” were altered to “*corporal presence*.” This appears to have been done at the instigation of Peter Gunning, who, as we are told by Burnet, “reconciled the opinion of a real presence in the sacrament with the last words of the rubric, ‘that the natural Body and Blood of CHRIST were in Heaven and not here; it being against the truth of CHRIST’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.’” At any rate the propriety of the alteration was seen by the rest of the Savoy Divines. There was no Papal party now to be reconciled, and therefore the change could only have been made with a view of expressing more clearly the mind of the Church in admitting the doctrine of the Real Presence. It often happens that in the heat of argument improper expressions are used to vindicate veritable truths; and so in the reign of Edward VI. the word *real* had been used for *corporal*; but now that the term *real* was applied more properly to the *spiritual* presence, as being connected with the *res sacramenti*, the impropriety was seen, and the more correct expression substituted.

In this way it is that Mr. Perry proves that both forms of declaration had the same meaning, and that that meaning is entirely consistent with a belief in, and the practice of adoration to, CHRIST really, though spiritually, present in the Eucharist under the form of bread and wine. We think he has satisfactorily proved his point, and that the diligence with which he has brought together so large a mass of valuable evidence will ensure for his volume a permanent position in our theological literature. We regret that we have no space remaining for any notice of his controversy with Mr. Freeman, or his answer to the Dean of Ripon’s allegations against Dr. Pusey. At the risk of being tedious we have, however, endeavoured to give some account of the argument of a book, which from its nature it is difficult to make interesting to those who are not already interested in the controversy.

LITTLEDALE ON THE MIXED CHALICE.

The Mixed Chalice. A Letter to Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter.
By RICHARD FREDERICK LITTLEDALE, M.A., LL.D., Priest of
the Church of England. London: G. J. Palmer.

WE do not give this Letter the prominence of an article, as believing for one moment, that the venerable Bishop of Exeter can have uttered the words attributed to him in the newspapers at his recent Visitation; and we are glad to see that Dr. Littledale introduces the salvo "if not erroneously reported." But the Letter in a very brief space so thoroughly exhausts the whole question, that it is deserving of very general study. Further we would add, that liturgiology has made such very great strides of late, that the question admits now of a more exact settlement than at any former period.

What we believe the Bishop really to have said is, that the Mixing of the Chalice is contrary to the law of the English Church. On this point we shall be constrained to differ entirely from his Lordship: but the tendency of his mind is known to yearn for that kind of literal exactness, which historical, equally with moral, questions will not really admit. In all such cases, i.e. where the absence of a positive injunction is made the foundation of a criminal accusation against one venturing on an act in itself well-nigh indifferent, the verdict so well known in Scotch law of "not proven" seem to us the right solution. It is the tendency of certain minds in all matters to say "Yes" or "No." In this manner we can quite understand, remembering some other of the Bishop of Exeter's decisions, that he may have "ruled" against the Mixed Chalice. More than this we do not think that he can have said.

Before coming to this point, however, we must give a brief summary of the evidence collected by Dr. Littledale in reference to the usages both of the Jews and of the early Christian Church.

1. As regards the Jews, Dr. Littledale tells us that

"To drink wine unmingled was regarded as a proof of profligate and barbaric habits even by the Greeks and Romans. Thus Plato alleges as a proof of the unrestrained usages of the Scythians, Thracians, and Persians, that they drank unmingled wine. And Mnesitheus, quoted by Athenæus, (who adopts his sentiments) says:

" 'And in the daily gatherings together,
To those who drink it sparingly and mixed,
It giveth joy; but in excess, disgrace.
If mixed in equal parts, it makes insane,
If all unmixed, it paralyses frames.'

"So completely did this rule prevail, that the name *wine* was applied to the mingled drink, even when much diluted. Thus Plutarch says, 'We call the mixture wine, even though it may contain more water.'

"Now it is to be noticed that the Syrians, under whom the Jews are classed by ancient writers, are not charged with the drunken habits of the Persians. This must arise either because their wines were too weak to cause intoxication, or because their customs were at least as temperate as those of their Gentile neighbours. The former theory is untenable, for not only does Holy Writ speak of wine in terms which do not allow us to doubt of its effects, but we have opportunities of estimating the opinion of foreigners touching the Palestinian grape. Thus that 'wine of Helbon,' of which the prophet Ezekiel speaks, was the favourite drink of the Kings of Persia, who even took the trouble of transplanting the vine to Damascus. So too Sidonius Apollinaris ranks the wines of Judea with the strong liquors of Chios and Falernum.

"*'Vina mihi non sunt Gazetica, Chia, Falerna,
Quasque Serapteno palmito missa bibas.'*

"We should therefore naturally conclude that the Jews, ruled as they were by a higher law than the Gentiles, would be more scrupulous than they, in particular at a time when the Pharisees and Essenes were so powerful.

"Least of all can we reverently suppose that He, Who did no sin, would have altered this temperate custom, unless the use of unmixed wine was a necessary part of the religious observance of the Passover. The Jewish evidence on this head is not very clear, but it is certainly, on the whole, against the unmixed cup."—Pp. 5, 6.

This view is maintained very positively by Lightfoot, who is the best authority on the subject of Jewish usages; also by Cosin and John Johnson.

2. The practice of the early Church in Mixing the Chalice is witnessed to us by all the Fathers who allude to the subject (save Origen), by several Councils, and by all the primitive liturgies that have come down to us, except the Armenian, into which there is good reason for believing that the omission of the practice had been introduced for the purpose of supporting the Monophysite heresy.

But the argument undoubtedly which is of most importance to us, is the authority of our own Prayer Book. Edward's First Book, it is well known, ordered the Mixed Chalice: the Book of 1662 does not order it. What are we to conclude? The Bishop of Exeter argues that it is forbidden. Dr. Littledale, supported by the known usage of Andrewes, Laud, and Cosin, contends that it is at least an open question. We will quote the passage at length.

"The disappearance of this Rubric from all the subsequent Books is the sole ground of the objection, so far as I am aware, which is raised against the Mixed Chalice. I shall endeavour to show that it is not

conclusive. The first and most obvious argument is that the removal of an injunction to do a thing is not identical with the imposition of a prohibition against doing it. The result is simply to leave the matter open. The opponents of the Mixed Chalice are still more averse to the elevation of the Sacrament, but if they insist on the prohibitory character of omission in one case, they must allow the converse proposition, that the removal of a prohibition is the re-imposition of a previous injunction. For all the old office-books enjoined the elevation of the Host after consecration. This was forbidden by a Rubric in the Book of 1549, which Rubric disappeared in the next revision. By a parity of reasoning, therefore, it would be necessary to return to the ancient usage in this particular, if we are obliged to avoid it in the other. The next criticism is that there is absolutely no direction given in the Rubrics as to the preparation of the elements, with the one exception that the bread must be wheaten. Of the wine nothing is said except by the Twenty-first Canon, which provides that it must be 'good and wholesome, and be brought to the Communion Table in a clean and sweet standing-pot, or stoup of pewter, if not of purer metal.' Of the interval between the time that it is so brought and the actual oblation there is no account given. There is not even a direction to pour any of it out of the stoup into a flagon, or chalice, which there was in the Book of 1549. Unless this be unlawful, which can hardly be maintained, the mixture of water in the chalice cannot be so, for they stand now on the same rubrical footing.

"Another parallel case is afforded by the omission of Prayers for the Dead in the revised Books. Yet it has been authoritatively decided that the Church of England in no respect prohibits them. If it be urged that the judgments of the Court of Arches, which ruled this point, are apt to be regulated by anything except law and theology, it is enough to reply that the decision in question was not delivered by Dr. Lushington, but by Sir Herbert Jenner Fust.

"Once more: The celebrated Rubric enjoining the continued use of those ornaments which had the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward the Sixth bears directly upon the question at issue. For the Book of 1549, which did not come into use till the third year of that reign, must, of course, so far as its specified ornaments are concerned, be recognized as a minimum by the aforesaid Rubric. As the priest was directed in it to mix water in the chalice, it follows that he must have had a vessel, or cruet, to hold the water. That cruet is, consequently, still a statutable church ornament, and undoubtedly cannot be meant to be put to no use. It is quite distinct from the ewer for the priest's ablutions, and rests on the same authority as organs and credence-tables, and other indirectly prescribed ornaments, of which your Lordship was the apologist in 1856."—Pp. 14, 15.

To us it appears that the same course was followed probably in this matter as in the Prayer for the Church in the Communion Service. Originally that prayer included the faithful departed as well as those who are yet alive. In Edward's Second Book the mention of the departed was omitted, and the invitation to prayer limited to the "Church Militant." The commemoration of the

saints departed is now happily again restored, but the restrictive title still remains. We see plainly here the result of a compromise. It was felt by the Catholic party that the thing itself was secured, and so they did not trouble about a mere title, which need not be used. In like manner the Mixed Chalice was allowed and in use, and therefore the rubric was superfluous, and, it was thought, might be omitted.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *The Ordinances of Spiritual Worship: their History, Meaning, and End*; considered in a series of Essays, from the writings of the Rev. E. F. MARCH-PHILLIPPS, M.A., late Rector of Hathern, and Chancellor of the Diocese of Gloucester. Selected and edited by his Daughter. Longman and Co.
2. *Memoir, with Extracts from the Diary and Sermons of Stafford Brown, M.A., sometime Vicar of Westbury, Wilts.* By his Widow. Rivingtons.

THESE two books resemble each other in more ways than one. In the first place, they are both what may be called tokens of affection to departed worth; and in this point of view they might fairly claim exemption from criticism. But they may also be regarded as illustrations of contemporary theology, and seen in this light they are worthy of some consideration. The latter of the two, it may be observed, is by far the most faithful portraiture of its subject, being arranged strictly according to time, and exhibiting all the changes of opinion which gradually took place in the mind of the individual commemorated; whereas the other is made up of Sermons and Essays, composed at different periods, and bears the stamp to a very considerable extent of the mind of the Editor. This circumstance prevents us from making the same use of the one volume as of the other. In both, nevertheless, we trace a gradual progress towards a sounder Creed, although in neither case can we affirm that the writer ever attained to the Catholic standard. Thus Mr. Phillipps never appears to have apprehended the objective notion of worship; and Mr. Stafford Brown informs us at the last, that CHRIST'S work for us was finished on the Cross! In both, nevertheless, there was a very marked progress towards the truth. The title of Mr. Phillipps' volume indicates sufficiently that his course was towards the more perfect apprehension of Sacramentalism; and from the memoir of Mr. Brown we shall quote two passages, which will abundantly speak for themselves. Thus, towards the end of his life, we have the remarkable confession:

"I have been thinking a good deal of late on the subject of ministerial absolution. It seems to me that I have not acted up, during my ministry

hitherto, to S. John xx. 22, 23; a commission extended to me when I received Priest's orders. As is always the case when our views are below our gifts, I recall many a troubled, though penitent and faithful, soul, whom I have allowed to depart this life without, what the Church calls, the 'ministry of absolution.' I look upon it that for persons generally, the general absolution in the Daily, and in the Communion, Service is sufficient, as authoritatively declaratory of the pardon which is conveyed by Christ, through His living ministry, to the really penitent and believing soul. But it seems to me that there are many persons, like those referred to in the exhortation in the Communion Service above quoted, who need more than this at our hands, and to whom we are commissioned to give more; that is, a closer, and more direct and personal, assurance of pardon,—conditional, of course, on their state of mind, which we can but fallibly pronounce upon. Perhaps this is generally desirable for the sick and dying, though our Church very properly confines it those who 'humbly and heartily desire it,' because to none other could it be comforting, or profitable. I confess, if I were dying, it would be of much comfort to me to be assured, (as Hooker and Bishop Sanderson were,) by a fellow minister, that I was not mistaken in my hope; that the blood of CHRIST was effectual to cleanse my sins, even mine."—Pp. 233, 234.

The other passage occurs in a very interesting letter, by his successor in the living of Westbury, and is as follows :

"It is undeniable that, in the space intervening between his entrance upon the ministry of CHRIST in the Isle of Wight and the finishing of his course in the Vicarage of Westbury, his opinion upon many elements of the Divine Truth had become materially altered. Doctrines of which he had, with others, stood in doubt, fearing their tendencies, and had regarded with suspicion, he had come, after longer study and more prayer, to accept fully and fearlessly, and to embrace cordially. He recognised them inwardly as he had done the others before them. He first tried them by the test of Holy Scripture, and did not find them wanting in authority. He then tried them by the test of daily use, and found them not charged with the poison he had anticipated, but healthful and nutritious. Thenceforth they were portions of his belief, together with the truths he had known and loved before. And the result was seen and to be read of men,—increased labour for CHRIST's sake, increased value for CHRIST's work, increased reverence, increased prayer and thanksgiving and praise, increased faith and love and peace and joy."—Pp. xi.—xii.

The establishment of Daily Service is one of the points specially referred to.

Lectures on the First Chapter of Genesis, showing man's interest in his Maker. By the Rev. B. J. SPRANGER, M.A. Masters.

THIS pamphlet contains eleven lectures on the first chapter of Genesis, each lecture being intended to establish some great theological truth—viz., that the chapter itself is a prophecy; that CHRIST is the Beginning, signified in the opening words; that the worship of Him is our own beginning, &c. As an introductory chapter, the author has added "a discourse by S. Gregory the Great on the Spirit of Prophecy," which would be of great benefit to any one as an introduction to the study of the Prophets. By understanding the "methods, times, and modes" by which the Spirit of Prophecy acts upon the minds of the Prophets, it will be easier to appreciate their value.

S. Gregory starts with the statement that "prophecy deals with three times, viz., past, present, and future;" and then proceeds from Scripture to show, by example, what these "three times" are.

1st. A prophecy concerning the future, Isa. vii. 14, "Behold, a Virgin shall conceive," &c.

2ndly. Of the past; viz., "In the beginning GOD created the heaven and the earth," Gen. i. 1; a man here spake of that time which existed before man's creation.

3rdly. A prophecy of the time present, as shown in 1 Cor. xiv. 24.

Prophecy therefore is shown not to be necessarily a prediction of things to come, but a revelation of some unknown fact, whether present, past, or future. The thought of a man before you is equally unseen with that of one not yet born; and the prophets also prophesied of the present time when not present in the body. Thus Gehazi was at a distance from the prophet, and yet the prophet said, "Went not mine heart with thee?" &c.

2ndly. Prophecies relating to different times help to confirm each other. Moses said, "In the beginning GOD created," &c.; and in order to confirm the truth of the first with regard to the past, he is permitted in the end of the same book to put into Jacob's mouth a prophecy of the future, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah," &c. Thus, in the fulfilment of the *future*, the accuracy of the *past* has been demonstrated. By the same rule, the prophecy of the past is used to prove the future. For instance, Daniel was required to tell what the *dream* of the King of Babylon had been, that he might be trusted in the interpretation (Dan. ii.); and as he accurately related what S. Gregory terms the "very root of the dream," he proved how truly he could speak upon the future.

Further, the discourse treats of the modes, limitations, and qualities of prophecy, the spirit of prophecy not being at all times present in the prophet's mind; nor, when it is present, always in the same manner—sometimes touching on the present, and not the future, and *vice versa*, and sometimes on the past, present, and future alike. S. Gregory gives instances; as when S. John Baptist, seeing the LORD, said, "Behold the Lamb of GOD," &c. But his gift did not extend into the future, for he sends before his death to ask, "Art Thou He that should come?" &c.

Again, in the history of Isaac and his two sons, Isaac told the tidings of events that should happen in distant ages, but knew not who was by his bedside. In this way the discourse goes to prove all the statements concerning prophecy. For example, when Elijah was to be taken up, the sons of the prophets spake of it to Elisha, saying, "Knowest thou that the LORD will take away thy master from thy head to-day?" (2 Kings ii. 3.) But when Elijah was gone, these same sons of the prophets went hither and thither among the rocks and valleys to look for Elijah. Thus we find that in part only were their minds enlightened concerning the future.

It sometimes also happens that the spirit of prophecy fails the prophet—is not, as it were, in action. We see an illustration of this when the man of GOD is sent to Samaria. GOD forbade him to eat bread by the way, but he was deceived by the lies of the false prophet. And

lastly it appears that sometimes, when prophets are consulted, they, from long habit of prophecy, are led to speak from their own minds, imagining all the time that they are acting by the Spirit of prophecy; as when Nathan said to David concerning the Temple, "Go do all that is in thine heart," &c.; and in the next verse we hear that the Word of the LORD came unto Nathan, saying, "Go tell My servant David, Thus saith the LORD, Shalt thou build Me an house," &c. (2 Sam. vii.) Thus Nathan the prophet, who first said, "*Go and do it*," is himself after, by the Spirit of prophecy, convinced of the error, and tells the king that it cannot be done. "Herein," says S. Gregory, "is the great difference between true and false prophets. True prophets, if ever they speak of their own spirit, soon set the minds of their hearers right again, as the Spirit teaches them better. But false prophets not only tell false tidings, but, being strangers to the HOLY GHOST, do persist in the lie."

If the translation of this discourse of S. Gregory's assist in disseminating correct views on the Prophet's office, it will really do good service. It will be a great step in theological science when persons come to understand that prophecy—i. e., the commission to speak in God's Name—is not a thing of the past; but, entrusted once to a body of men distinct from the Priesthood, it was, in the Person of CHRIST, united to the priestly office, and is now perpetuated in His representatives, and that henceforward in the Church the office of Moses and Aaron will never again be "put asunder."

We have dwelt so long on the preliminary discourse, that we have no space for further notice of Mr. Spranger's interesting "Lectures."

We are glad to be able to bestow the highest commendation on Miss YONGE's *Conversations on the Catechism*, (Mozley,) of which the third and concluding volume has just appeared. We consider it in every way the best work that has proceeded from her pen. The parts taken by the several speakers are admirably managed, and the doctrinal exposition of the Sacraments is thoroughly satisfactory; having, if we mistake not, undergone some correction since it originally appeared in the pages of "The Monthly Packet." The typical allusions of the Old Testament are very skilfully introduced, and there are copious references to the most important testimonies of the Fathers. We know of no more valuable book to put in the hands of young persons.

THRUPP ON THE SONG OF SONGS.

The Song of Songs: a Revised Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By JOSEPH FRANCIS THRUPP, M.A., Vicar of Barrington. Macmillan and Co., Cambridge and London.

MR. THRUPP has already entitled himself to the gratitude of the Church by his valuable work, on the study and use of the Psalms: a work to which we would gladly, on some future occasion, invite at length the attention of our readers. In fact we have not yet realized, if we must use that American phrase, the full value of the use of the Psalms. We are ready enough to expatiate on their value as part of Scripture, as prophetic and as doctrinal; but all this is very far short of the actual value of the Psalms. Above all other parts of Scripture the Psalms are revelations of the Incarnate Mind; records and confessions of the Heart of JESUS. Hence their unspeakable importance to the growth and development and building up of the Christian character in the individual. Hence it was right in the old time,—would that in this respect the modern time was as faithful as the old,—to require of all candidates for Holy Orders that they should know all the Psalms off by heart. To know the Psalms was and is to know the Mind of CHRIST.

Reverently holding that there is not only a mystery in the Scriptures, but also in the order of the Scriptures, we wish that Mr. Thrupp had been led to prepare an edition and interpretation of the book of Proverbs before undertaking the book of Canticles. For we may well believe that these oracles of God “speak wisdom among them that are perfect,” and provide food for the regenerated *intellect* as a necessary preparation to the right understanding of that book of Revelation, which next to the “book of the Revelation of JESUS CHRIST,” is beyond all calculation the most sacramental of all the writings of God. In short, what is true of the several parts of the Pentateuch, is true of the several successive books of Scripture. A right understanding of what goes before is indispensable to a right understanding of what follows; for there is order in all the multitude of all the thoughts of God. Perhaps had Mr. Thrupp thus taken the books in order he would have escaped the error which so greatly mars the present work. For it is matter as much of pain as surprise, to find that Mr. Thrupp sturdily denies that Solomon is the author of the Song of Songs. Nay, more; he goes so far as to guess a date; and of all epochs which he was free to choose, he has fixed upon the age of Elijah. He is not very distinct in his assertion of this; but he

VOL. XXV.—AUGUST, 1863.

2 z

has not a doubt apparently that the song was produced in some one of the colleges of the Prophets, and not earlier than one hundred years at least after the death of Solomon.

We shall not go into the arguments by which Mr. Thrupp endeavours to fortify this position. They are, without exception, devoid of root and substance. But we may pause a moment to weigh Mr. Thrupp's theory. The age of Elijah was in the annals of Israel every way exceptional. All the foundations out of course, Israel was no longer a light to Israel; and if we venture to peer into the mystery which hangs around the birth of the Tishbite, we are led to the conclusion that the mighty teacher was an alien to the commonwealth of Israel; the marvellous scion of some one of those uncovenanted tribes of the desert which could claim as their own such memorable names as Job and Jethro. The spiritual happiness of Israel was at no period of the history of the nation at a lower ebb than in the days of Elijah. A more uncongenial moment could not be selected for the conception or composition of such a work. The great masters of prophecy had not yet risen in the kingdom of Judah. Isaiah and Amos had not yet uttered those awful revelations, which we may well believe did not at first minister much either of comfort or confidence; but which, so far as we may say it, were more in keeping with the then existing moral condition of the nation, than the warm and tender, and melting utterances of the Song of Songs. And if there is any weight to be attached to a remark thrown out above, that there is a mystery in the order of the books of Scripture, which if we are to enter fully into the several works must never be violated, there is here a further argument against Mr. Thrupp's new-light fancy. Canticles becomes an isolated work; it is broken off from the foregoing Scripture; it has, regarded in its structure and design, no analogy to what follows; ranking no longer as the seal of its own class of writings, it is to be viewed as a mystical prelude to works in the most part historical, unsystematic, and in structure inartificial, and rarely if ever, strictly speaking, mystical!

Mr. Thrupp has been betrayed into a sorry, and much-to-be-regretted anachronism, which is all the more disappointing, because but for this we could have ranked Mr. Thrupp among the most catholic and conservative of theologians. Indeed he vindicates his claims to be so accounted by the earnestness with which he maintains against literal and semi-literal expositors that mystical sense, which, as the Church has ever held, characterises throughout this most wonderful book. Under those two heads we may include all who do not adopt the purely mystical method of understanding the poem. The *literal* school will include all those writers who see in the Song of Songs a highly poetical record, and—as Theodore of Mopsuestia held—vindication of Solomon's marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh, or a mere dramatic poem setting forth

the love of Solomon and some country maiden ; as it is regarded by the modern Jews, and Ammon, and Hitzig, and the whole school of German neologians. On the other hand, the semi-literal school embraces the more numerous body of those who discover an historical basis in the poem, and who find this basis in the marriage of Solomon and the daughter of the king of Egypt. But there are no trifling differences in this body according as the allegoric or the historical element is held to prevail. With Grotius the historical—with our own Lowth the allegorical, was the predominant subject. The purely mystical school of exposition likewise present many varieties of opinion, some inclining to the view of the synagogue, and understanding the Bride to be the Church of Moses ; some on the contrary taking her to be the Church of CHRIST, while the poem itself sets forth in mystery the several successive epochs of the Church.

Lastly, not to enter more into detail, there is the large, and we trust increasing, number of those who regard the main interest of the poem as centring in the union and reunion of the divine Bridegroom and the Bride, who by the Bride understand the Church of God from the beginning ideally conceived. And this, the true traditional interpretation forms one of the most precious deposits of the Church of God ; while itself furnishes as it were, an enamel for that more interior sense of the song which was first developed by Gregory of Nyssa. This view regarded the Bride as representing the human soul. This legitimate application of the song is based as all legitimate *application* must be—on a foregoing legitimate *interpretation*.

Among the many truths put “out of course” by the Reformation more or less there must be reckoned the right understanding of the Song of Songs. It is not indeed a little remarkable that such a writer as à Kempis, whose mind seems to have been saturated with the spiritual teachings of the Canticles, should have so rarely quoted from the Book itself. Only twice does he quote, and there he shows himself to be a strict disciple of the school of Gregory of Nyssa.¹ Those historianising interpretations which were so welcome to Roman divines of the Reformation time were adopted in

¹ Lib. iv. cap. ix. § 2. *Me oportet contentum esse in lumine veræ fidei, et in ea ambulare, donec aspirat dies æternæ charitatis, et umbræ figurarum inclinentur.* And again, Lib. iv. cap. xiii. § 2, he hears the vox discipuli addressing the LORD. *Vere tu es dilectus meus electus de millibus* in quo complacuit animæ meæ habitare omnibus diebus vitæ suæ. The honour of inventing that method of interpretation which makes the blessed Virgin Mary the Bride belongs not to the Roman but the Eastern Church. It was in the metrical paraphrase, (its being metrical may perhaps be some excuse,) of the Greek physician, Michael Constantine Psellus, that the first improper introduction of our LORD's mother into the Song may be found. On the other hand it is to be confessed that the first to expound the whole Song of her was Rupert of Deutz, in 1135. The idea of interpreting in this way never seems to have crossed the minds of either S. Bernard or the great Irishman who succeeded him as Abbot of Clairvaux, Gilbert of Hoyland, “*vir sane Bernardo dicendi gravitate et pietate non multum inferior.*”

the protestant schools with more or less of minuteness. Amid the general unfaithfulness to catholic teaching it is gratifying to be able to point to the English Bible as bearing its testimony to the ancient truth. It is true that we cannot lay any stress on the authority of the headings to the chapters in the Authorised Version; but they testify very clearly to the maintenance among the teachers of our Church of the true interpretation at a time when it was becoming so very faint in the Western Church. Such headings as the "Church's love unto CHRIST," (Ch. i.), "the mutual love of CHRIST and His Church," (Ch. ii.), "the Church's fight and victory in temptation, the Church glorieth in CHRIST," (Ch. iii.), "CHRIST setteth forth the graces of His Church, the Church prayeth to be made fit for His presence," (Ch. iv.), "CHRIST awaketh the Church with His calling," (Ch. v.), "the Church professeth her faith in CHRIST," (Ch. vi.), "a further description of the Church's graces," (Ch. vii.), "the love of the Church to CHRIST, the vehemency of love, the calling of the Gentiles, the Church prayeth for CHRIST's coming," (Ch. viii.)—such headings as these plainly testify that polemical exigencies of their day had not made them indifferent to the true teaching of the Word of God.

It is a subject for thankfulness to the Giver of that Word that while contending ecclesiastics were casting about for hermeneutical discoveries, and at a time when the theologians of the Roman obedience were committing the Western Church to the preposterous novelty that the Bride was the blessed Virgin Mary, in a sense which Cornelius à Lapide calls, "*tertius sensus principalis*," the Church in this land was bearing witness to ancient interpretation, and was putting it on record for the widest diffusion through the then present and all succeeding generations of Anglo-Catholics.

To the converted Jew, Nicolas de Lyra, who flourished in 1341 we owe what was so very important to a right and wholesome use of the Song itself. By attempting a systematic arrangement of the contents, which in a choric poem of this kind, as in the odes of the Greek dramatists forms so essential an element, he was rendering very material service to the Church. But unfortunately if his principle was right, his application of it was wrong; and even to this day this remains the crux for all interpreters, how to divide the poem, and assign to the proper speakers their several parts.

It is in this respect that Mr. Thrupp's volume is most valuable. While in his conjectural criticisms he seems too venturesome, and now and then in his translation somewhat deficient in taste, in his disposition of the text he appears to us to have come as near as possible to determining and fixing the dramatic parts. We propose then giving a more detailed account of the division of the whole song, and the apportionment of the parts; reserving

some little space in the close for some general remarks on the use of this most precious portion of the Word of God.

I. Mr. Thrupp differing, and judiciously differing, from previous commentators in fixing the number and determining the subject-matter of the several cantos, decides for the number six, with an epilogue. Virtually he thus adopts a sevenfold division as *à priori* to be expected in what is the special utterance of the Sevenfold Spirit of God. The six cantos he entitles in order: 1. The anticipation; 2. The awaiting; 3. The espousal and its results; 4. The absence; 5. The presence; 6. Love's triumph; and then the conclusion. There can be little doubt in the minds of devout students of the Word of God that many of its statements are regulated by a respect for numbers. The Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, so far as the Beatitudes are concerned: the Lord's Prayer, the Parables of the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. No one can question that the whole structure of the Apocalypse is regulated by a *number-principle*, if we may so express ourselves; and a system which can be so abundantly illustrated from the Songs of David, we may reasonably suppose was not without influencing the structure of the Song of Songs. Mr. Thrupp very properly regards it as dividing itself into two great portions; the earlier including three, the latter four cantos. Accordingly the division of the whole poem, and the limits of the successive cantos or odes having been thus fixed, we proceed to examine the contents as to the symmetrical arrangement of the several parts.

The first section, which Mr. Thrupp entitles, "The Anticipation," extends from the 2nd verse to the 2nd chap. 7th verse inclusive, and thus comprises twenty-three verses. The symmetry of the whole passage is determined by the central portion of the section, which is often apparently an isolated sentence. In the instance just now under review the central part comprises the three verses of the first chapter, 12, 13, 14. On each side of the centre are two well-marked portions, each of three verses; while outside of these there are the two remaining portions, which each reckon seven verses, or in other words there are the seven opening and the seven closing sentences of the section.

We pass on to the second part or "the awaiting." This consists of fifteen verses, (ii. 8—iii. 5), the central and very isolated verse, (ii. 15), determining the division. A system of seven verses conducts to this, and it is followed by another system of seven verses.

The third section of the Song, in which all the interest of its earlier portion culminates, consists like the first section of twenty-three verses, (iii. 6—v. 1). The opening strophe, comprising six verses, has a corresponding antistrophe of six verses in the close. The intermediate eleven verses arrange themselves into two groups of five each round the solitary central verse, (iv. 6.)

(*To be continued.*)

THE MARTYRDOM OF S. IGNATIUS,

VIEWED IN RELATION TO THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS.

THE object of the following remarks is to induce such of our readers as may have given but little time and study to the perusal of the writings of the great doctors of the Church to drink for themselves of those refreshing draughts which flow alone from these well-springs of Apostolical tradition. Lest by some we should be deemed too obscure, and by others too dry and too minute in our details, we will just mention what we are going to write and to what class of readers our observations are meant to be applied. The writer knows from experience that there is a very large body of the clergy, some very well informed and very orthodox parish priests, who for years past in the way of *real study* never open a book. Such persons have all received a liberal education, and several have taken honours in their respective Universities; moreover they read a great deal on the whole, considering the numerous claims upon their time and energies. They spend occasionally a considerable amount of thought upon the preparation of their sermons: they are tolerably well up in the current theological controversies of the day; and they can give a reason and a fair and legitimate one too, for the side which they espouse in such controversies—if they took kindly to their Greek Testament at college, they keep up the reading of it now in a desultory, un-critical sort of way—if they learned a smattering of Hebrew years ago, it pleases them when they meet with a note referring to a Hebrew word to turn the word out in their Hebrew lexicon, they are surprised how much they have forgotten, they wish that they had kept up their reading more than they have done. The class of men whom we are describing are far from being stupid or ignorant men. They have read Hooker, Bull, and Pearson, thoroughly, have looked over the patristic extracts which are contained in those incomparable works: they separate clearly between the fathers of the Alexandrian school and those of the Western Church—between the verbal moralism of S. Chrysostom and the spiritual fervour of S. Bernard and of Ludolph of Saxony: yet they have never made a single patristic treatise their own—never viewed it in its many lights—never applied its illustrations to the elucidation of Scriptural difficulties, nor its incidental allusions to the unravelling of some now almost forgotten practice of the primitive Church: much less have the words and phrases been noted down—their spiritual contrasted with their profane meanings—nor have the ethics of the treatise been distinguished from the higher ethics of the Gentile philosophers.

There are many ways in which it is easy to account for this state of things. It is always burdensome to begin a new task that involves any mental labour or discipline, and every new writer seems to be dry until one has caught his spirit and meaning. And then when the effort has been made, no practical good seems to follow from it: the increased precision of thought, the opening up of a hundred familiar subjects from a new point of view; the infusion into one's own heart of that same earnest spirit of burning zeal, devotion, and love, which burned in another's soul so many centuries ago: these are all results that cannot be calculated upon beforehand; they grow out of the work as it proceeds—and as they come out more and more clearly, they make the hour devoted to such reading to be the most interesting and longed for hour of the whole day. Many are very willing to devote themselves anew to a limited course of earnest theological study, but they do not know where to begin, what books to procure, how to turn them to the best account,—what to do when a difficulty arises, with no reference ready to hand, and an obstacle before their path, that of themselves they are unable to remove. It is some of these obvious difficulties and discouragements that we propose to meet and to solve. The finished scholar will find little or nothing to interest him in what we are going to say—the man who can fluently read off at sight any Latin or Greek writer, tracing out his analogies, mastering every detail as he quickly journeys on, is a man who is sufficient for himself, who carries out and more than exceeds all that we wish to place before our readers in this paper—as the goal to be arrived at by some toil and great pains. Would that there were more men of this stamp to be found in our ordinary run of parish priests.

Let it be observed, moreover, that although it is not impossible for a man of fair classical attainments and of studious habits in the course of some years to read through all the Fathers of any moment, it is quite impossible for any one mind to *represent* even inadequately the multitudinous phases of thought which are presented by such a large class of writers separated from each other by education, local influence, and the time and circumstance under which they wrote. “The Fathers” is an expression which well-meaning and orthodox persons are in the habit of using vaguely—with an equal mixture of reverence and indistinctness of what is implied in the term. Each school of patristic theology has its own determined and distinguishing characteristics. Particular doctrines or confutations of heresy; of explanations of Holy Scripture, belong to particular writers, which however marked may be their own individuality as a class, form but one group, or but one of a series. For example, no man could thoroughly relish and work out both S. Chrysostom and Origen. If he delights in what may be truly called the *onomatomachos* of S. Chrysostom, in his

extreme verbal refinement, in his arguments so very often founded upon the use of the synonym for the word itself; or upon one tense being substituted for another; he would care but little for the loose, sublime, far-fetched, over-strained, yet gloriously coloured allegory of Origen. Both of these writers may be read educationally, but our sympathies must hold either with one or the other. They are different masters in the faith, we cannot bow down and serve both. There are some minds to whom all the heathen philosophy and especially the heathen mythology are exceedingly distasteful, who love plain and simple statements of Catholic dogma viewed after a moral or a spiritual sense. The Epistles of S. Clement, the unpoetical writings of S. Hippolytus, large portions of the works of SS. Irenæus, Augustine, and Anselm, respond to their feelings and kindle their devotions. To such minds as these, the wordy rhetoric of the Apologists, the subtle deductions of Tertullian, the polished diction of Arnobius and Lactantius, have indeed but little attraction; they long for something more simple, that comes more directly home to their own experiences, that satisfies more completely their own internal longings. Many a man has been set against "the Fathers" by making one essay upon a mind uncongenial to his own—he finds heathen worship controverted where he expected an early light to be thrown upon his own faith; or he finds an allegorical interpretation where he sought for a plain explanation of a text or of a doctrine. Others have made an attempt with but slender scholarship, and that but half remembered, to read one of the more difficult of the Greek Fathers, such as the orations of S. Gregory Nazianzen, and finding the labour great and the profit but small, have turned away from all patristic reading with a kind of distaste which it will take long to overcome. In a limited way to smoothe the road for travellers who will follow us is the object of the few following remarks, which remarks we shall endeavour to illustrate by adducing an example taken from one of the sub-Apostolic Fathers.

There are a few postulates that must be allowed to us at starting. Firstly, it must be granted that all our patristic studies converge and centre round the inspired canon of Holy Scripture. It may be that we fully recognise the value of the *Church's tradition* both as to doctrine and ritual—it may be that we allow of the existence of a vast body of *unwritten tradition*, yet for the purposes of teaching and of demonstration the Bible must be the basis of our operations. In our pulpits we may cite S. Peter where modern usage would not permit to cite S. Ignatius—our business being then to interpret S. Peter by S. Ignatius—to give the *substance*, when the *form* is not admissible. The more closely the letter of the New Testament is studied, the more directly do we find it to bear upon all

the cardinal doctrines of the faith; its *very words* are so many *witnesses* to the teaching of the Church. In its intrinsic value the New Testament then ought to be the centre of our operations—the focus towards which all our readings converge—the fount from whence all our studies proceed. A man that knows well the *litera scripta* of the New Testament and can bring passages from the Fathers to bear upon it, is a man whom it is impossible to take at a disadvantage—in a controversy his weapons are ever at hand; while for exposition and exhortation he is never at a loss. The leaven of the early Fathers leavens his every thought, and when he is thrown upon his own resources, he explains it as S. Hippolytus, or S. Chrysostom, or Origen, would have done; and when subsequently he compares what he has said with what they have said, he finds a marvellous similarity between the two interpretations. He has hardly reached their depth, but he has accurately caught their spirit. He has grown up a theologian, he knows not how or when; the waters he has tasted have become truly in him “wells of water.” All the best theologians of the Western Church have been distinguished for their deep knowledge of Holy Scripture—they have combined the highest patristic with the highest scriptural lore. Amongst ourselves, who is at once so “mighty in the Scriptures,” and in the Fathers, as the venerated author of the “Commentary upon the Minor Prophets” which is now making its appearance? We dwell upon this point, because this fundamental principle of theological study has been slightly undervalued by many earnest members of what may be called the revival school amongst ourselves. They read much and well,—Greek Liturgies, Durandus, SS. Ambrose and Bernard most of all, they consult Peter Lombard and S. Thomas Aquinas, as to points of theological controversy, but they stop short of the “end in itself,”—of the end of ends,—the referring these matters to the sacred Records of the New Law—and this we conceive to be a very grievous mistake. Confining our remarks to the Greek Fathers, it may be asked, how do they in such an extraordinary way bear upon the inspired canon? We answer that the *very words* of the LXX. and of the New Testament, are interpreted for us by them: and that all technical or liturgical words have a definite position assigned to them thereby. We may have used a word in one sense only—the Fathers expand its meaning manifoldly; conversely we may have used a word in many senses—the Fathers restrict and limit its application. As an example of the first case when our Blessed Lord speaks of the relations between a man and his wife, (S. Matt. xix. 7, v. 31; S. Mark x. 4,) He used the term “bill” or “writing of divorcement,” *βιβλίον ἀποσταλείου*—by which phrase the LXX. render the “sêpher cherithoth” of Deut. xxiv. 1. Isaiah uses the word in the same sense, “where is the

bill of your mother's divorcement," (l. 1.) The word *ἀποστασίου* then is a technical word, having but this its literal technical application both in the Old and in the New Testaments. Origen in his fourth homily upon Jeremiah, (Heuet. Vol. I. p. 74, c.) invests it with another application. He says, "Let us read all the Epistles of the Apostle Paul, and let us write them in our hearts, living according to them, that a 'writing of divorcement may not be given to us, (*ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἡμῖν δοθῇ βιβλίον ἀποστασίου*),' but that we may be made coheirs with JESUS CHRIST." This is one of the last words that we should have expected to have found so used and invested with a new signification. The words "Eucharist," or "deacon," or "bread," and numberless others that might be mentioned, have various meanings in the New Testament, but they very soon became fixed and unaltered in their significations in the earliest of the Fathers. We have then to trace the actual process of the fixation of the meaning of words—the *initial processes* of which are to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. To note on the other hand the gradual extension of use which is to be met with in other words until they drop out of ecclesiastical diction altogether. Words have another use, they fix the readings of the New Testament: every new Codex of a Greek Father that is brought to light is just one step more towards determining the real text of the New Testament. This is now so commonly known and acknowledged that to dwell upon it would be superfluous. If from words we pass on to sentences, in them we find the texts and whole passages of Scripture illustrated, firstly by an explanation of that particular passage; secondly, by enforcing in the plainest manner a doctrine which is contained in that passage in a dim and indistinct way; and thirdly, by that passage being brought into contact with other passages, its meaning being so fixed by this *juxtaposition*. The very quotation carries its own interpretation with it. It is illustrated by all the other members of the series to which it belongs. This last fact is very important to bear in mind. The whole value of S. Irenæus as an expositor of Scripture hangs upon this *juxtaposition* of texts. Tertullian's Commentary consists exclusively in the *use* to which he puts the various verses which are cited by him. Take the verse of Galatians iv. 27, where S. Paul quotes the fifty-fourth of Isaiah. S. Irenæus joins this with Eph. iii. 6, the Gentiles fellow-heirs of the same body; with 1 Cor. xv. 23, the promise of the mortal being made immortal; with Hosea ii. 24, how those who were not a people and not beloved, are both such now; with Rom. xi. 33, the height of the riches, of the wisdom, and the knowledge of God. From the title of the chapter, "On what it is to esteem that some have more, and that others have less knowledge,"—and from the arrangement of the texts, it comes out very plainly, that the *desolate* are those who were thought to be the *ignorant* ones; but to the desolate

both knowledge and love are granted at length, (lib. i. c. 4.) When showing from whom the Church received the gospel, S. Irenæus (lib. iii. c. 1,) groups together S. John xiv. 17, Acts i. 8, Ps. xviii. 5, Rom. x. 18, to prove that these teachers, "quidam et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes evangelium Dei." Lastly, when remarking on the cause for which circumcision was given, we have Colos. ii. 11; Dent. x. 16; Rom. iii. 6, 4; Gen. xix.; Heb. xi., put down side by side, to prove that circumcision was but a sign—that it was "consummatio justitiæ," that Abraham was called before it; Noah was not circumcised at all; and Enoch pleased God being uncircumcised. (Lib. xv. 80.)

It does not follow that these examples that we have selected are the best that could be found in S. Irenæus for illustrating our meaning,—they are but taken almost at random out of a very large number—yet they are sufficient to point out how account must be had of the use of the Fathers of placing texts in *juxtaposition* to prove certain points, as one step towards the interpretation of these texts when treated of singly and alone. After this long digression, as our second postulate let it be granted, that when we take up any definite line of reading we do it for a definite purpose, with a definite object before us. It is quite right to read a Father through for the *first* time just to see what he says, and to catch his spirit and to master his style—and when in this first perusal we meet with anything very valuable, or original, or striking, to make an effort to fix that particular thing upon our minds. Such study as this is but preparatory; for we must set out with a clear object placed before us; a particular doctrine or a set of doctrines to be looked for and to be explained—or certain words to be illustrated—or definite portions of Holy Scripture to be commented upon. This is the only way to fix one's reading thoroughly in the mind, to read for something and to keep that something ever before the mind's eye.

To bring these remarks more home to us we will apply them to a very short Ecclesiastical production, and to one of the least pregnant that it is possible to conceive, with the matter about which we have been writing—it is the ACTS OF THE MARTYRDOM OF S. IGNATIUS, which were written by an eye-witness of the whole scene, in the year of grace 110, which were first published in a complete form by Dr. Grabe in his "Spicilegium Patrum." This tract is to be found in Cotellier's great work, or in the smaller production of Dr. Jacobson, and of Dr. Hefele, or of Dr. X. Reithmayr, the last being a most convenient and beautifully printed small pocket volume. In the first chapter we find it mentioned that Trajan having lately received the command of the Roman Empire, Ignatius, who was a disciple of the Evangelist S. John, in all things an apostolic man, governed the Church at Antioch. The value of *tradition* is indicated by the terms in which S. Ignatius is thus

introduced to the reader. A similitude is now used, in which the Church is compared to a ship, a simile to be found in nearly all the Fathers from the Apostolical Constitutions downwards. Thus S. Ignatius does not merely rule, but he *pilots* (κυβέρινα) the Church of Antioch. He was the good κυβερνήτης, and as such he piloted the Church through the Domitian persecution. Now, although in the later Greek writers, in Plato (Phædrus, 247, c.) and others "Kubernêtes" stands for a governor, its meaning is definitely settled here by the introduction of the two words, οἶαξ, a helm or tiller, and ζάλα, the surging of the sea: ῥένος, the band, brace, hawser; and then there is the χειμῶν, which has but lately passed away. All the metaphors hold good, and they have, moreover, an innate propriety in them. The good pilot regulated the course of the vessel by the helm of prayer and fasting; by *continuity* (συνεχία) of doctrine; and by spiritual bands or braces he resisted the surging sea, yet fearing lest some of the faint-hearted should sink. In S. Matthew xvii. 21, in S. Mark ix. 29, in 1 Cor. vii. 5, prayer is united with fasting, for fasting and mortification gives great cogency to prayer.

But once in the New Testament (1 Thess. v. 14) is the word ἀλγέφυκος used, of these feeble-minded ones who sadly need support when the waves and billows (χειμῶνας) are going over them. Another painful voyage was over: the Church, like her great prototype the *Ark of Noah*, was peaceably resting upon the mount of God; the whale bearing the LORD's prophet had cast him out upon the dry land; the old vessel, the flesh of Eve, in which S. Paul was shipwrecked, was broken up, and gone to pieces: but a better, a new, a solid ship which exhibited the full form and lineaments of the faith of the Church came safely into the Roman port and harbour, (S. Paulinus, Ep. 36.) What need for us further to describe her glorious course? her winds of the HOLY GHOST, her yards and masts, a cross; her cords of charity that bind her to that cross; the very wood, that rod that springs from the Root of Jesse, that rules over the four-oared galleys of our whole body. A ship this to the masts of which we are bound in hope, in faith, in charity, believing with the heart, confessing with the mouth the Undivided TRINITY, (S. Paul. Ep. 4): *a ship out of which there is no salvation*, likened to the house of Rahab, to the blood-spotted lintels of God's chosen ones in Goshen, a ship ever buoyant and ever floating; waves and billows roar, but God that dwelleth on high is mightier; this figure of a ship and of the ark came so home to men's minds by the wonderful analogies that it presented to the Catholic Church in all things, that S. Peter Damian was but echoing the common cry when he exclaimed, "*Quid per arcam, nisi SANCTA designatur ECCLESIA?*" (T. ii. p. 32, b.) That the disciples' want of faith in the storm that arose over the Galilean sea should itself pass into a parable, (S. Matt. viii. 23, 28,) that faithless boat

originating the lesson that "*ecclesiæ inter quas verbum Dei non vigilaverit naufragæ sunt*," (S. Hil. Poict., fol. 498. c.) The few introductory lines of our early simple martyrology open up a line of patristic thought that runs along many a page for centuries afterwards, and connects this homely narrative with many of the brightest treasures of ecclesiastical antiquity.

II. To proceed: it was not enough that the Church obtained rest and tranquillity, S. Ignatius was doubting concerning himself that *really* he had not attained to the love of CHRIST, nor to the perfect rank or order of a disciple. He thought that the confession which is made by martyrdom would bring him to a greater familiarity with the LORD. He obtained his wish after remaining a few years in the Church, and enlightening after the manner of a divine light the hearts of each by the exposition of the Scriptures. The phrase *παρίζων δίκην θεϊκοῦ λόγου*, reminds of our Blessed LORD's words of S. John Baptist, (S. John v. 35,) "He was the lamp burning and shining." And the Church was enlightened by the exegesis of the Scriptures, *διὰ τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τῶν γραφῶν*: the noun *ἐξήγησις* never occurs in the New Testament, and the verb *ἐξηγέομαι* is always used in the sense of declaiming or maintaining; that the *exegesis* here means more than this is evident from the Syriac paraphrase: *explaining* the Scriptures which were disclosed to him through prayer: which writings or Scriptures might with equal force apply to *all the written traditions of the Church*, as well as to those writings only, the sum of which are included in the sacred canon. See we not in this holy martyr that striving after the *rule of perfection*, which the later saints desired so ardently to follow? That second baptism was ever in his sight. It was not enough for him to be a good, a wise, a holy, and a CHRIST loving Bishop; a good shepherd ready to lay down his life for the sheep; he had not laid it down, and till that act was completed, and the final sacrifice in this world was made, he had not attained to the perfect *taxis*, to the high standard of his full discipleship. In all his Epistles which he wrote on his way to Rome the same wish is repeated; one expression of it is a sample of the others, "Suffer me to be food for the wild beasts, through whom I shall attain unto God. For I am the wheat of God, and I shall be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts that I may be found the *pure bread* of CHRIST." (Ad Rom. c. 4.) A mystical allusion to the communion that flows from the partaking of that One Bread.

III. This narrative explains the meaning of S. Ignatius' name, *Theophorus*. When the Bishop was brought before the emperor Trajan, who was on his way to Armenia, he told the Emperor that having (ἐχων) CHRIST the heavenly he was able to dissolve all the snares of the evil spirits. Trajan asks, "And who is Theophorus?" Ignatius answers, "He who has CHRIST in his breast." After some other questions and answers Trajan says, "Do you then

carry Him Who was crucified, within you?" S. Ignatius replies, "Yes, for it is written, I will dwell in them, and walk in them," (Levit. xxvi. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 16.) Trajan sentenced him, "We command Ignatius, saying that he bears in himself the Crucified One, to be carried bound by soldiers to the great Rome." We do not deem the tradition that S. Ignatius was the child taken up by our Blessed LORD as a pattern of humility, (S. Matt. xviii. 3,) to be supported upon valid testimony, although it is endorsed with names of Metaphrastes and Nicephorus. There is no doubt that *Theophorus* signifies a person who is made divine by the Godhead dwelling within him through the power of the HOLY GHOST. This is evidently the meaning that S. Ignatius himself attaches to his own name, and he acknowledges to the Emperor that this was the sense in which he received this appellation. His martyrology sets this question quite at rest in our minds. This dialogue is principally interesting to us as teaching us how literally Holy Scripture was interpreted in primitive times. CHRIST dwelling in the souls of the faithful, their bodies becoming a temple of the HOLY GHOST, was to the early Christians no mere figure of speech, but a profound and a sustaining reality. As Almighty GOD dwelt in a special and peculiar manner in the tabernacle and the temple, so to the faithful under the new law does CHRIST become in them the hope of glory. In you—"The image of CHRIST formed within you," the witness in himself, a true abiding presence. The kingdom of GOD not without, but within; CHRIST having come in and taken up His abode within the soul: as the prophet said, "My tabernacle also shall be with them," (Ezek. xxxvii. 27). It was this firm belief in this indwelling presence of his LORD and SAVIOUR that made S. Ignatius so firmly, nay, so joyfully meet his dreadful death. The Shepherd of S. Hermas says that a man is able to fulfil all those commands who has the LORD in his heart, (*qui habet Dominum in corde suo*. Lib. ii. c. 12.) Elsewhere he mentions those not bearing the LORD in their hearts, (*in corde non ferentes*. L. iii. c. 9.) Not without a due significance did S. Chrysostom speak of S. Ignatius as τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκητήριον.

IV. A very remarkable expression is found in the third chapter of this Act. S. Ignatius on his way to Rome calls at Smyrna to see S. Polycarp, the bishop then being brought to him and communicating to him some *spiritual gifts*, (*καὶ πνευματικῶν αὐτῷ κοινωνήσας χαρισμάτων*.) Afterwards the different Churches of Asia came to him by their representative Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, that "if by any means they might receive some part of his spiritual gifts," (*μέρος χαρίσματος πνευματικοῦ*); from the repetition of this formula, it is evident that it was used for some special and distinctive gift; that these words conveyed to the Churches, to whom the relation of the martyrdom was made, a certain well-known meaning and sense; the phrase is borrowed from S. Paul, (Rom. i. 11,) "that I may impart

to you *some spiritual gift*." We hardly think that it is a Eucharistic symbol, because every duly ordained Bishop and Priest had the prerogative of offering up the Holy sacrifice with all its supernatural grace and power. That a *high celebration* took place at Smyrna when these Bishops and Saints were gathered together, seems to be more than probable; but the special gift here recorded, was the power of *working miracles*, so that we are here furnished with an incidental testimony of the highest authority, of the continuance of Apostolical gifts to a successor of the Apostles. Nothing can be more arbitrary or more illogical, to allow the gifts of supernatural powers to the fathers of the subapostolic age, and then to assert their withdrawal from the Church. Limit them to the Apostles, and we can understand the line of argument to be taken: extend their exercise beyond the Apostles, and who shall dare to say when and with whom God's hand was shortened? If the testimony of honest God-fearing contemporaries is of any weight,—if history be history—and words have any meaning, then these gifts were continued long after the times of which we are treating now. As to the gift of prophecy, S. Justin does not hesitate to appeal to it, as so well known that it could be made the basis of an argument. He reasons thus with Trypho, (Dial. 82,) "For prophetic gifts (*προφητικά χαρίσματα καὶ μέχρι νῦν ἐστὶν*) remain with us even to this time, from which you ought to understand, that those which were formerly lodged with your nation, are now transferred to us." Origen takes just the same line of argument with regard to miracles in general; the Jews having retained no vestiges of the Divine presence, neither have they prophecies nor miracles, of which the footsteps are found to a certain degree with the Christians, and some of them of more import than the Jewish miracles themselves (C. Cel. i. 8,) and in the first book of the same treatise explaining S. Paul's words, (1 Cor. ii. 4,) in the demonstration of the spirit and of power, "he alludes to the traces of miracles which are still preserved amongst those who live according to the will of the Word." (c. 4.) In the third book of the same treatise (c. 28,) he speaks of miracles being augmented in the latter times, and of the *οὐκ ὀλίγαι θεραπείαι* and of the other heavenly manifestations that cannot be despised. S. Irenæus (ii. 57,) details the various gifts, casting out devils, prophesying, healing the sick, raising the dead, these same gifts having been specified by S. Paul, (1 Cor. xii.) and accounts for their possession thus: "Wherefore also those who were truly His disciples, receiving grace from Him, performed these things for the benefit of the rest of men, as each one received the gift, (donum) from Him." Again, (v. 6,) "we hear of many of the brethren in the Church who have prophetic gifts (*prophetica charismata*), who through the Spirit, speak in all tongues, making manifest the secret things of men for their benefit, and who expound the mysteries of God." This is the meaning and true signifi-

cation of that *χάρισμα* which the representative clergy of the Asian Churches came to Smyrna in the hope of obtaining some portion of. If some be inclined to ask, why was this gift not spoken of in terms more clear and in language less ambiguous,—we would answer, that the *discipline of the Secret*, was in force to regulate the open exposition of doctrine, all the faithful would understand what the *spiritual gift* really was,—the unbelievers would be deprived of all occasion for scorn. It is worthy of remark in passing, that these representative clergy consisted of the three orders, which are so distinguished as the *ἐπίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι, διάκονοι*, the same who are so very often referred to by S. Ignatius himself, in his own glorious epistles. Also we would note, that after leaving Smyrna, S. Ignatius followed very much in S. Paul's course to Rome, Troas, Philippi, Neapolis, he saw Puteoli and wanted to land there, "being desirous to walk from thence, in the way that Paul the Apostle had gone; but the wind carried the vessel on, and he reached Rome in a very short time. The brethren at Rome saluted him, and after having commended the Churches to the Son of God," he was led to the Amphitheatre and thrown in amongst the wild beasts, the end of the spectacle being at hand.

V. We would mention the relics of the martyr, who desired "that he might be burdensome to none of the brethren by the gathering up of his relics, but that he might be wholly devoured—for only the harder of his holy bones remained, which were carried away to Antioch, and there stored up in a linen cloth as an inestimable treasure (*θησαυρὸς ἀτίμητος*) left to the holy Church by the grace that was in the martyr." "Similarly of S. Polycarp, his bones were gathered up from the fire, more precious than the richest jewels and tried above gold; they were deposited where it was fitting that they should be," (i.e. under the altar) and his anniversary was kept with all due solemnity and joy, and the catacombs tell their story of the altar tombs of the relics with which they are stored. Prudentius is ever singing of them in his Christian strains of soothing verse. S. Paulinus of Nola, good simple minded Saint as he was, attaches to them great power and efficacy; the relic is expressed by the technical word *λείψανον*, we find it in the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. vi.) "neither are dishonoured the relics (*λείψανα*) of those who live to God," and S. Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. xviii.) calls the body of S. Cyprian *ἄγια λείψανα* and S. Chrysostom says very elegantly (Homil. 92.) that "God has divided the martyrs with us; taking their souls, their bodies He has given to us, that we may possess their holy bones a perpetual incitement to virtue." Nicephorus of Constantinople, writes in his epistle to S. Leo, "I worship and embrace the venerable relics, (*λείψανα*) of the saints, as the surgery of souls, (*ιατρῆιον ψυχικόν*) and of the affections of the body." "We venerate" says Photius, "the temples of the saints, their sepulchres and other relics," (*καὶ λείψανα*—Ep. I. 19.) Every student knows full well

how eagerly these memorials of the departed in the LORD, were sought for by all the great church founders of early times; what faith, and love, and devotion, they enkindled; to what memories they were bound; what courage they imparted when courage was indeed too sorely tried by the fire of persecution. Along the whole line of Church history we trace upwards, their love and their veneration, now hiding themselves amidst the ruins of the catacombs, now associated with the pious deeds of Queens, of S. Helena or Eudoxia, exclaiming at last with Theofridus the abbot: "O mira divinæ pietatis inseratio! O ineffabilis circa sanctorum reliquias dignatio. Deus sanctorum est et sanctorum congregatio Dei habitatio est. Non parvi sed maximi apud eum pretii sunt reliquiae illorum quas exaltat super omnem mundi ornatum."

VI. The last chapter of the Act is extremely valuable, it describes the conduct of the followers of S. Ignatius in Rome, after the Saint's martyrdom. These faithful ones had assembled to *keep vigil* on this succeeding night, they could hardly realize the events of the day, that their good Bishop and Shepherd had indeed suffered; that he was still alive and present with them in the spirit; that he had won the martyr's crown, and that he was now numbered amongst those virgin souls who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. They knew and felt that their faith was weak and wavering, and so with humiliation and prayer, they took their case to God; beseeching Him to fill up the lack of faith which came to them from their weakness, in apprehending all these events that had just happened to the Saintly Bishop. God in His own way heard and answered their prayer, whilst they were in a state between waking and sleeping, (μικρὸν ἀφηνώσαντες) three separate visions were vouchsafed to three companies of these Christians, each of which visions was an advance upon the other; each of which contained both a moral and a mystery. To some the Saint suddenly appears standing up and embracing them (περικτυσσόμενον); their minds were full of him, and they were worn and weary, and God sends the vision of their loved one to embrace them, and to comfort them again once more. And the moral of the vision is this, that there is a *presence* of the souls of the faithful departed, with those who are still left here on earth to faint and to pray; that the invisible Church is ever holding communion with the Church visible; that this communion alone realizes the Church's doctrine of the Communion of Saints; that the cloud of witnesses about our path, is not alone composed of angels, but in part consists of the spirits of those whom we have known and loved in the tabernacle of the flesh. Again, others beheld the Blessed Ignatius praying over them, (ἐπευχόμενον) as well as a *presence*, there is also an *intercession* of saints. The pure spirit of the martyr,—dove-like—was praying over and interceding for those whom he had loved and who still were walking in the weakness of the body. He had been accepted by God; he had been

tried and not been found wanting, and now by his merits he pleads to Him, who by His merits, is ever pleading for all His saints at the throne of the eternal FATHER. In the third vision, the Saint appears dropping with sweat (σταζόμενον ὑφ' ἰδρωτός) as if having come from a great agony, (ἐκ πολλοῦ καμάτου) and standing with the LORD." This was the higher *revelation of suffering*; this the sign and seal of how hardly he had won the crown—of what grace and power he had been made a partaker—of how completely he had won the battle, the LORD was with him, as with the holy children in the fire. When thou walkest through the fire of suffering I will be with thee. This last vision was a showing of the mighty conflict the martyr had been called upon to engage in. Ere he had "trodden under foot the devil, and had perfected the course of his CHRIST-loving (φιλοχρίστου ἐπιθυμίας) in JESUS CHRIST our LORD." With regard to these visions, we would remark upon the strictly guarded nature of the language used; they were tokens of God's speaking to the soul when upon the confines of consciousness as to the things of this lower world. Many visions such as these—as true and more wonderful—God has granted to His Saints for the further confirmation of their faith, and how presume we, to say that these things could not be? Dr. Jacobson has a note upon these occurrences in his edition of the Apostolical Fathers, which is worthy of remark, because Dr. Jacobson seldom gives a note of his own. He simply copies the critical remark of Ussher, Clericus, Smith, or Pearson; but when the Professor speaks he speaks oracularly; he does what Plato ever set his face against,—he places *opinion* against *knowledge*—thus he refutes the visions,—“In *my opinion* all these things smell of an age far more recent than that of Ignatius.” (Vol. ii. p. 577.)

VII. This concluding chapter of the martyrdom has also a high value from the *liturgical words* which are employed in it, and for the evidence it gives us of certain customs being early observed in the Church. These Christians were holding a midnight vigil (παννυχίσαντες); for the verb παννυχίζω is used by Aristophanes (Ran. 443, Nub. 1069), in the sense of spending the long night—keeping either festival or fast. This fast called here *pannuchis*, is evidently the same as the Greeks afterwards called ὑπέρθεσις, of which Fabricius says “*superpositio* usquam in alterum diem fiat,”—it was observed in some churches on Saturday night and on Easter Eve. It is implied in Tertullian's second book to his wife, that having a heathen husband she could not stay up and watch the night. In the Pædagogus (lib. 9, c. iv.) S. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the αἱ παννυχίδες αἱ μάταιοι—of those foolish vigils and of the vigils for drink—ἡ παννυχὶς ἐπὶ πότῳ, against both of which he warns the neophyte in very strong terms; from which we learn, that perhaps for the purposes of concealment, the early Christians gave an old heathen name to one of their own very dif-

ferent meetings. These faithful men did not keep their night watch in any public place, but κατ' οἶκον—in their own private house. The Latin equivalent for this pannuchis is "*pervigilium*." Another peculiar word, which occurs in the preceding section also is *gonyklisia* (γονυκλισία), with the kneeling down of all the brethren (μετὰ γονυκλισίας) which corresponds with the event of Tyre, when S. Paul with the Christians, their wives and their children, kneeled down on the shore (θέντες τὰ γόνατα) Acts xxi. 5. S. Hermas is very fond of this expression, "I came to a plain and here *falling down upon my knees*," (Past. I. i. and elsewhere.) It is needless to refer to the New Testament now to show how prayer is ever coupled with the bending of the knees: or how at the dedication of the Temple Solomon kneels upon his knees, (1 Kings viii. 45 :) or how Daniel "kneeled upon his knees three times a day" (Dan. vi. 10,) or how Tertullian speaks of the "*adorare de geniculis*," or how Marcus Aurelius describes the Christian soldiers as praying for the rain, according to their custom with the knee placed upon the earth (γονυθέντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.) S. Justin adds his witness to this method of praying, which became so deep rooted a custom in the Church that it had to be taken notice of by general councils, and to be made the subject of a special enactment. On Sunday, on Pentecostal days, some had prayed *kneeling*. They were now bidden by the last canon of the first Nicene Council to pray standing. The 90th Canon of the Council in Trullo commanded ταῖς κυριακαῖς μὴ γόνα κλίνειν. Germanus forbid all γονυκλισία on the feast of our LORD's Resurrection, which signifies our lifting up from the fall of sin. In the frescoed chambers of the catacombs we find the figures represented as praying standing. Two conclusions flow from the occurrence of this word "*gonyklisia*" in the acts of this martyrdom. Firstly the ancient date of these acts: while this was the common position at prayer, such had not been as yet prohibited by any enactments. Secondly the nature of this vigil, that was being kept, it was a *fast*, not a feast—it was a service of lowliness and humiliation, not a *pannuchis* of joy or of making merry. Another liturgical expression is found in this same chapter of the Act. "We have made known to you both the day and the time, that having assembled at the time (or the anniversary of the martyr) we may communicate with the Athletes." Here we find distinctly noted the celebration of the martyr's "*genethlios*" or birthday of eternal life, the anniversary of which, the Church from the beginning has celebrated year by year. The church at Smyrna met yearly to celebrate the day of the martyrdom of S. Polycarp. S. Peter Chrysologus tells us "that such birthdays of the martyrs are worthily celebrated." (Serm. cxxix.) S. Cyprian writes about them to the Presbyters and deacons of the church at Carthage. This phrase—"συναγόμενοι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν"—not only witnesses to the Church's early commemoration of her

Saints and Martyrs, but it also witnesses her firm hope in the resurrection of the dead, the day on which the faithful die on earth, is not their earthly but their real birthday, it is the day and the time when they first begin their glorious travail of eternity; no cause for sorrow this, but for holy joy, mingled with fear lest we be not with them partakers of God's everlasting glory. The *doxology* with which the narration closes has its own morsel of doctrine to teach. JESUS CHRIST is called our LORD (Κύριος), "by Whom and *with* Whom to the FATHER, the glory and the might." This μεθ' οὗ Bishop Bull has pointed out as confirming the consubstantiality of the FATHER with the SON; and when to this formula is added, "*with* the HOLY SPIRIT," it shows that the doctrine of the procession of the HOLY GHOST from the FATHER and the SON, by which so great communion and unity is established between the two, is not so clearly to be deduced as when ἐν is substituted for the σύν. Athenagoras goes so far as to say that the FATHER and the SON are one by their unity through the Spirit. We cannot stay to mention how many New Testament words find place in this brief memorial, the αὐτοπαῖς and the ἀφουκνῶα of S. Luke, the χάματος derived from that κάμνω which is recorded in the Apocalypse, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle of S. James.

We took up this martyrdom of S. Ignatius as being one of the shortest, simplest, and least instructive of any of the ecclesiastical documents of the sub-apostolical age. We have but glanced over it hurriedly and cursorily, passing by many an interesting topic which its text at once suggested. Has it furnished us with no hints to be placed in our note books or upon the margins of our Bibles? Has it given to us any insight into the interior life and working of the Christian Church at the beginning of the second century? If this short analysis has really taught us nothing, the fault lies in the commentator, and not in the text; but if it be otherwise, as the writer humbly trusts that it is, then this conclusion follows as a matter of course. What greater riches, what nobler treasures ought we not to look for in treatises of a subsequent age—when dogma had become consolidated—when church polity had been thoroughly organized—when Christian literature had absorbed into itself all that was valuable in the dark teaching that went before it—and when a strong and hearty school of Christian philosophy and ethics had been established in more than one great city? Further study would prove that these expectations are not indeed held in vain.

SHARPE'S EGYPTIAN MYTHOLOGY.

Egyptian Mythology and Egyptian Christianity, with their influence on the opinions of Modern Christendom. By SAMUEL SHARPE, Author of "The History of Egypt." London : Russell Smith. 1863.

MR. SAMUEL SHARPE is, we suppose, a great authority on all questions of Egyptian antiquities. The volume which we are about to review is the eighth which has proceeded from his pen. We do not, therefore, cast any doubt on his diligence or accuracy, when we remind him of the proverb "*ne sutor ultra crepidam.*" We only think it unfortunate for his own reputation, that he has intruded into the province of theology; but nevertheless he has done good service to the cause of Christianity by showing the feebleness of the strongest weapons with which a man of such great learning was able to assail it. It is indeed an illustration of the marvellous way in which all things turn to the advantage of CHRIST'S Church, because Mr. Sharpe's argument is really calculated to build up that which it was intended to destroy.

Mr. Sharpe is apparently a man of one subject; and the whole study of his life seems to have been devoted to the tombs, the mummies, and the monumental inscriptions of Egypt. From these he read the mythology and philosophy of the old Egyptians, and finding some things which struck him as being in remarkable agreement with Christianity, he concluded at once that Christianity was nothing else but a modified form of Egyptian mythology. This is the important discovery which Mr. Sharpe has imparted to the world, but we question whether the faith of any one, who regards Christianity as divine, will be shaken by the announcement that it was dug out of the Egyptian tombs.

If Mr. Sharpe's learning had been more varied than it appears to be, he would have known that, widely diverse as were the old mythologies of the heathen world, there are probably none which are not capable of a similar treatment. Some relics of primeval religion remained embedded in them all, and some lines of divine light, shining from afar, floated through the darkness which overspread the world. On Mr. Sharpe's principle it might not be impossible to construct Christianity out of the Scandinavian, Celtic, or Hindoo mythology. The doctrine of sacrifice, for instance, is common to them all, instead of being peculiar to Egypt only; and therefore we cannot for a moment suppose that any one will be weak enough to be persuaded by Mr. Sharpe that the great fact of the Atonement was nothing but the product of Egyptian thought.

Did not the Greek mythology teach the same thing, and was not the sacrifice of Iphigenia an instance of a propitiation offered to an offended Deity?

We will, however, follow the course of Mr. Sharpe's argument in order to show, as we hope to do, the entire emptiness of his conclusions. The following passage sets forth the intention of the book as well as the opinions of its author:

"The following are the principal doctrines which are most certainly known to be common to Egyptian mythology and modern orthodoxy, as distinguished from the religion of JESUS. They include the Trinity, the two natures of CHRIST, and the Atonement by vicarious sufferings.

"1st. That the creation and government of the world is not the work of one simple and undivided being, but of one GOD, made up of several persons. This is the doctrine of Plurality in Unity.

"2nd. That happiness or the favour of the Judge of the living and the dead could scarcely be hoped for, either from his justice or his mercy, unless an atoning sacrifice had been paid to him on our behalf, by a divine being; and that mankind, or some part of them, may hope to have their sins forgiven because of the merits and intercession of that Being, and to be excused from punishment because he consented to be sacrificed for them. With the Egyptians there were four such chief mediators.

"3rd. That among the gods or persons who compose the godhead, one, though a god, could yet suffer pain and be put to death.

"4th. That a god, or man, or being half god and half man, once lived upon earth, who had been born of an earthly mother but without an earthly father."—P. 10.

And then follows the mention of some European customs which Mr. Sharpe supposes to have been borrowed from Egypt; the use of the ring in marriage, which we believe was a Roman custom, also; the wedding of the Adriatic, as an imitation of the ceremony in which the priests of Philœ cast a piece of gold into the river Nile to purchase an abundant harvest; the Doge's cap copied from the crown of Lower Egypt; the Christmas game of drawing lots for King and Queen; Candlemas-day, borrowed from a feast of candles at Saïs—why not from the Chinese feast of lanterns?—the priestly tonsure and the linen surplice. That Jewish priests wore linen garments appears to be a fact unknown to our Egyptian antiquarian.

The doctrine of the Trinity, which, of course, Mr. Sharpe disbelieves, is represented as an invention of the Egyptian priests. It is generally admitted that Polytheism arose from the Deification of the several attributes of the One God, Who was the object of primeval worship; and there seems to have lingered amongst the Egyptians a belief that, although a multitude of gods were worshipped, yet one alone was supreme, from whom all things pro-

ceeded. Osiris was therefore to the Egyptian the *Rex et Pater Deorum*. Trinities were invented, for the notion of the Trinity is an idea innate in the human mind. All things group themselves in the same number. In time we have past, present, and future. In order and magnitude there is the equal, the less, and the greater. In reasoning three terms are necessary to a conclusion. Father, mother, and child, make up the family relationship; and seeing, as we do, the image of the Trinity projected on everything around, we cannot think it any striking peculiarity of the Egyptian mind that the poetic fancy had grouped the gods of the country in the same natural order. Thus we find three gods often associated together in the same sculpture, and an inscription exists in the British Museum of as early a date as the eighth century before the Christian era, which states that three gods, Isis, Nephthis, and Osiris, make only one person. This is represented as identical with the Christian faith. We believe, however, in Three Persons in One God, and not in three Gods in one person, and therefore we cannot see how the Athanasian doctrine was an imitation of Egyptian mythology.

The following account is given of the creation of the world :

"The Egyptian's opinion of the creation was the growth of his own river's bank. The thoughtful man, who saw the Nile every year lay a body of solid manure upon his field, was able to measure against the walls of the old temples that the ground was slowly but silently rising. An increase of the earth was being brought about by the river. Hence he readily believed that the world itself had of old been formed 'out of water and by means of water.' (2 S. Peter iii. 5.) The philosophers were nearly of the same opinion. They held that matter was in itself eternal, like the other gods, and that our world, in the beginning, before it took any shape upon itself, was like thin mud, or a mass of water containing all things that were afterwards to be brought forth out of it. When the water had by its divine will separated itself from the earth, then the great Ra, the sun, sent down his quickening heat, and plants and animals came forth out of the wet land, as the insects are spawned out of the fields, before the eyes of the husbandman, every autumn after the Nile's overflow has retreated."—P. 67.

This is doubtless interesting as containing some relics of primitive tradition, but we are not sure that other mythologies would not furnish analogies with the Scriptural narrative quite as striking as this.

The two natures of our Blessed SAVIOUR, His death and resurrection, are supposed by Mr. Sharpe to be copied from the story of Osiris. Osiris and his family once lived upon the earth. His wife and sister Isis was a goddess, whilst Osiris himself had two natures, being partly man and partly god. He was put to death by the wicked Typhon, the hippopotamus, and his limbs were scattered to

the four winds. These Isis collected and put together again, and Osiris returned to life, but not to live on earth. He became judge of the dead in the infernal regions. His son Horus avenged Osiris's death and is styled the avenger of his father. We may see here an acknowledgment of the evils to which goodness is liable amidst the wickedness of the world, and a belief in the judgment to come which is common to all heathen systems, but we can see nothing which could be supposed to have suggested a belief in the death and resurrection of our LORD. It was not as a sacrifice for the sins of the world that Osiris died, and no human hand was the avenger of the SAVIOUR's blood. Traces of propitiatory sacrifice we may find amongst the Egyptians, but the marvel of mercy, which was shown by the Almighty FATHER in giving up His only Begotten SON as a sin-offering for the world, was amongst the depths of wisdom which human ingenuity could never have discovered. That a sinless man would meet with persecution and be put to death, the sagacity of Plato had been able to predict, but that GOD should give His SON as a ransom for the world was a proof of greater love and wisdom than man could ever have discovered.

That the first two chapters of S. Luke's and S. Matthew's gospels were borrowed from a series of sculptures on the wall of the temple of Luxor, is an assertion which we can scarcely read without laughing at its absurdity. We beg Mr. Sharpe's pardon; for we have no wish to ridicule any one, however misguided he may be, and we feel moreover that it is no laughing matter to find a man, possessed of undoubted learning and diligence, so entirely perverted in judgment through prejudice against Christianity.

"This opinion," says Mr. Sharpe, "of the miraculous birth of the Kings is well explained by a series of sculptures on the wall of the temple of Luxor (see fig. 28.) First the god Thoth with the head of an Ibis, and with his ink and pence in his left hand, as the messenger of the gods, like the Mercury of the Greeks, tells the maiden Queen Mautmes, that she is to give birth to a son who is to be King Amunothph III. Secondly, the god Kneph, *the spirit*, with a ram's head, and the goddess Athor, with the sun and cow's horns upon her head, both take hold of the Queen by her hands, and put into her mouth the character for life, which is to be the life of the coming child. Thirdly, the Queen when the child is to be born is seated on the midwife's stool, as described in Exodus i. 16; two of the attending nurses rub her hands to ease the pains of childbirth, while another of the nurses holds up the baby, over which is written the name of King Amunothph III. He holds his finger to his mouth to mark his infancy; he has not yet learned to speak. Lastly, the several gods or priests attend in adoration on their knees to present their gifts to this wonderful child, who is seated in the midst of them, and is receiving their homage. *In this picture we have the Annunciation, the Conception, the Birth, and the Adoration, as described in the first and second chapters of Luke's gospel,*

and as we have historical assurance that the chapters in Matthew's gospel, which contain the miraculous birth of Jesus, are an after addition not in the earliest manuscripts; it seems probable that these two poetical chapters in Luke may also be unhistorical, and be borrowed from the Egyptian accounts of the miraculous birth of their Kings."—Pp. 18, 19.

The homage paid to infant princes has found many examples amongst all civilized nations; but if we could reproduce the wood-cut (fig. 28,) it would be at once apparent, that the prince who is receiving adoration, is by no means an infant of a few days old, but a youth who sits up without assistance or support. He no longer places his finger on his mouth in token of his infancy; and more than this, the subjects who are represented as offering homage to Amunothph III. are Egyptians, and not foreigners from the distant east. The gifts presented are not gold, frankincense, and myrrh, but apparently lotus flowers; and therefore we might just as well say that the homage paid at Gloucester to Henry III. was not an historic fact, as that the Divine record contained in the commencement of the Gospels is only a fable copied from this sculpture. Nor can we see why Romulus the son of Mars by the vestal virgin Rhea Sylvia, should not have been chosen by Mr. Sharpe as the foundation for the Annunciation and Birth of our Blessed Lord.

The following passage represents the Egyptian opinion respecting the future judgment:—

"That solemn trial of every man for his conduct in this life, which was to fix his reward or punishment in the next, is one of the most interesting of the pictures on the funereal papyri, and was enacted by the priests as part of the funeral ceremony (see fig. 70.) They put on masks distinctive of the several gods, and thus received the body in due form, Osiris sat on a raised throne, holding his two sceptres and wearing the crown of Upper Egypt. Before him were placed the offerings, and near him were seated the four lesser gods of the dead. The deceased holds up his hands in prayer, and is introduced by two goddesses, each wearing on her head the emblem of truth. The wicked Typhon, as a hippopotamus, the Cerberus of the Greeks, accuses him to the judge, and demands that he shall be punished; while the four lesser gods of the dead intercede as advocates or mediators on his behalf. But a large pair of scales is set up, which is quietly adjusted by the dog-headed Anubis and the hawk-headed Horus. In one scale is placed the heart or conduct of the deceased, and in the other a figure of the goddess of truth. A small weight is moved along the beam by Horus to make the two scales balance, and to determine how much the conduct falls short of the standard weight. Forty-two assessors are at hand to assist Osiris in forming his judgment, and each declares the deceased man's innocence of that particular crime of which that assessor takes notice. The judgment when pronounced is written down by the Ibis-headed Thoth, as recording angel or god of writing. Thus are measured the goodness

and the failings of the life lately ended. Those who were too uncultivated to listen to a sermon might thus learn wisdom from what they saw with their eyes, and this ceremony was a forcible method of teaching the ignorant multitude that a day of judgment awaits us all after death, and that we should so regulate our lives that when weighed in the great balance they may not be found wanting.

"But notwithstanding this show of a trial, and this ceremony of the great scales, the Egyptians, like other pagan nations, had very little trust in the justice of the judge; and to bribe him and to appease his wrath they prudently brought their sin-offerings, which in our figure lie upon the altar in the shape of a Lotus flower. The same offerings are laid before the assessors in the hope that they also may be persuaded to return favourable answers to the questions that the judge may put to them. Again the four lesser gods, who come forward as the friends and advocates of the trembling sinner, may be seen at the head of a tablet in the British Museum, strengthening their mediation on his behalf by laying their own gifts upon the altar before Osiris."—Pp. 49—52.

The idea of rewards and punishments after death was common to all heathen nations, which can be said in any degree to possess a religion at all; and curious as the Egyptian idea may be, as manifesting, amongst a multitude of superstitions, some remains of the primeval religion of the world, we cannot but notice that it differs from the Christian doctrine in its most important and distinctive phases. The Lotus flower cannot represent the sin-offering, for without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin; and although the four lesser gods are found interceding for the departed soul, there is a total absence of all that could in any degree represent "the LAMB as it had been slain." There is however one exception to this to be found in fig. 72, when the deceased has placed these four lesser gods upon the altar; but yet, even this after all is a very vague emblem of the great sacrifice of atonement, since we hear nothing of their dying for the sins of men, and we do not know in what capacity they are presented to Osiris.

The belief of the Egyptians in the ultimate resurrection of the dead is evident from the care which they bestowed on the remains of the departed. The embalmment of the body preserved it for the return of the soul at some ultimate period, but the intermediate time was filled up by a series of transmigrations through which the spirit first must pass. There is surely no analogy between this wild fancy and the intermediate state of rest or misery which the Christian Faith unfolds; but on the authority of one figure Mr. Sharpe believes that another opinion prevailed amongst the Egyptians at a later period of their history.

"It was only at a late time," says Mr. Sharpe, "perhaps not till after their intercourse with the Greeks, that some few of the Egyptians entertained the opinion of a spiritual resurrection without the help of the dead body. They show this opinion in the painting by giving to a

man at the moment of his death two bodies, the one earthly and mortal, and the other angelic and immortal, (see fig. 74). The vault of heaven is represented by the outstretched figure of the goddess Neith, painted blue. On each side sits a figure of the ram-headed Kneph, holding the feather, the character for truth, to show that the dead man is righteous, or has been acquitted by the judge Osiris. In the middle is the earthly body, painted red, falling to the ground in death, while the heavenly body, painted blue, stands upright and holds up his hands in the attitude of prayer. This picture describes the opinion of the Apostle Paul, who says, 1 Cor. xv. 44, 'There is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body.'—P. 54.

Nevertheless we remain unconvinced by Mr. Sharpe's argument that S. Paul's words had anything to do with this Egyptian opinion, which after all prevailed to a very limited extent. There is however another reading of the figure which may be in stricter harmony with the Apostle's words. The body as it falls to the ground in death, and the same body as it rises again when the spirit has returned may be intended to be represented, and in this sense it may be the natural and the spiritual body of which S. Paul wrote.

There are some minor particulars in which Mr. Sharpe betrays his ignorance of all besides the subject to the study of which his life appears to have been devoted. Such for instance is the following passage :—

"This low intercolumnar wall (in the temple of Dendera), like the screen in our cathedrals between the choir and the nave, betrays a wish on the part of the priests to increase the distance between themselves and the laity. They thus said to the rest of the nation, Stand apart by yourselves and come not near to us, for we are holier than you are. It was after seeing the evils which thus grew out of an established priesthood, that the Jewish lawgiver told the Israelites that they were themselves 'a holy nation and a kingdom of Priests,' Exod. xix. 6. They needed no such separate class; and it would seem that it did not exist in Judea till after the establishment of the monarchy."—P. 26.

We always thought that the tribe of Levi was specially severed from the rest of the tribes that it might be a priestly tribe; and the history of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram proves that none but those who were appointed thereunto might handle holy things. The arrangements of the tabernacle moreover provided for a separation of the Priests from the laity as much as the chancel screens of Christian churches.

We must however pass on to the influence which Egyptian opinions were supposed to exercise on modern Christendom. The Persians, on the conquest of Egypt, B.C. 528, made strenuous efforts to substitute their worship of the sun for the polytheism, which was the long established religion of the nation. The story of Cambyzes and the bull Apis suggests the probability that they

were not very successful in their endeavour; but if they made no impression on the minds of the people, they did not fail to leave some evidence of their sojourn on the monumental inscriptions. In the fourth century before the Christian era Plato the Athenian visited Egypt, and whilst studying at Heliopolis, where was then a celebrated school of philosophy, he imbibed many ideas which were there taught. This was the medium through which Egyptian mysticism passed into the Neo-platonism which some centuries afterwards was dominant at Alexandria.

Heliopolis lost its importance when the Greek city of Alexandria rose to be the university of the world. Here it was that under the Ptolemies Platonism found its home, and it was here that the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek by the Septuagint Fathers, but the evidence that Egyptian mythology had influence on the Septuagint translation, is really too weak to be worthy of much notice. The following example shall suffice:

“When Isaiah (ch. xi. 2) describes the Spirit of the LORD, as a Spirit of wisdom and understanding, a Spirit of counsel and might, a Spirit of knowledge and Godly fear, the Jews of Egypt made these six qualities of the mind into six angelic beings, which had proceeded from the ALMIGHTY, and they added a spirit of piety, to complete the mystic number of seven, which, with the ALMIGHTY Himself afterwards made the Ogdoad.”—P. 76.

Christianity was first preached in Egypt by the Evangelist S. Mark; we have however but little record of the spread of the Gospel in Alexandria during the first century. Considering that it was the resort of men of science and learning from all nations, it was a most important post to be gained. There probably the battle with Gnosticism was the hottest, and, in after years, Alexandria became the chief nursery of the Eastern Church. From this it must naturally have happened, that Alexandrian opinions exercised an extensive influence on Christendom, but yet it must be remembered that Alexandria was scarcely Egyptian; Greeks, Jews, and Orientals were largely mingled amongst its inhabitants, and therefore we cannot regard the Alexandrian schools as in any distinctive sense Egyptian; still less can we suppose that Egyptian opinions were adopted by S. Barnabas and Apollos. That S. Barnabas should have used the Egyptian illustration of the Phoenix, a fact which Mr. Sharpe does not notice, proves nothing more than that he was familiar with the fable, and thought it a fitting parable, under which the doctrine of the Resurrection might be taught. That the commencement of S. Matthew and S. Luke's Gospels were borrowed from Egyptian sources, is, we think, a theory which will find but few supporters; we are not called on to answer the assertion, as it remains for Mr. Sharpe to exhibit his proofs. He will say of course, that the oldest MSS. with which we are acquainted,

are of Alexandrian origin, but we must remind him, that as long as Christianity has been taught, the divinity of our LORD, and His birth of a virgin mother, have been uniformly held. Whatever concessions may have been made to Egyptian ideas, they must have been much the same as S. Paul's appeal to the Athenians. An altar was erected to the unknown God, and this gave opportunity to S. Paul to declare, that He, whom they ignorantly worshipped, was the God whom he preached. S. John again, in the first chapter of his gospel, is supposed to have had the Gnostics in his view, and to have shown to them that all their fancied æons were fulfilled in our Blessed LORD. So likewise the preachers of the Gospel in Egypt would have found a belief in a future judgment, interceding Gods, and the resurrection of the dead, a ground on which the Gospel seed might with good hope be scattered abroad.

Egyptian superstitions, no doubt, had influence in the development of heresies which arose in Egypt, but this is a very different thing from the assertion that Nicene Christianity was the product of Egyptian mythology. Gnosticism, Ophitism, and Manichæism were always treated as heresies, and certainly were never incorporated into Christian doctrine.

The following statement is about as far from the truth as any thing which could have been imagined, and suggests the alternative that its author must either be very dishonest, or entirely ignorant of the subject of which he writes.

"At Nicæa, as is usually the case in an assembly of divines, the more superstitious talked down and frowned down the more reasonable. The Emperor sided with the Egyptians, which may be explained by what we have before seen, because Greece and Rome had been used to look up to Egypt as their teacher in religion; and he had lately, on building Constantinople, received from Alexandria fifty copies of Church Lessons, for the use of his new churches. The Egyptian opinions, supported by the eloquence and earnestness of the young Athanasius, the spokesman of the Egyptian Bishops, prevailed. He drew up the celebrated form of words, now known by the name of the Nicene Creed, as a statement of the opinions which the Egyptians contended for, and the Council ended their labours, by ordering every body to receive it as the true Christian faith."—P. 104.

The traditions of no nation in particular, but of the Church in general, were examined at Nicæa, a city which was not in Egypt but in Bithynia. The greatest theologians of the day had studied at Alexandria, but this was because the schools of that city were most usually resorted to. Bishops were assembled from every nation in Christendom; the creeds which have been used and taught and handed down from their fathers were compared. It was no Egyptian doctrine which was struggling to gain the ascendancy, but the faith which was once delivered to the saints, and which had been handed down unchanged, even to the time, when

the Bishops of the universal Church were assembled at Nicæa to vindicate the divine honour of the SON of GOD.

Not yet, however, has Mr. Sharpe finished the chain of evidence by which he attempts to prove that Catholic Christianity was derived from Egyptian Mysticism. The old temples of Egypt were readily fitted to the new religion. The great courtyard of the temple of Medinet Abou at Thebes was used as a Cathedral Church, dedicated to S. Athanasius. The mythological inscriptions were in some instances plastered over with mud from the Nile, whilst in others the figure of S. Peter was painted over that of the old god of the temple; and the sculptured scene now represents King Ramenoph II. presenting his offerings to the Christian Apostle. Is Mr. Sharpe ignorant that the Basilicas at Rome became Christian churches; and that there still exists in the eternal city an image of S. Peter which once represented Jupiter Tonans, in which the only alteration made was, that the thunderbolt was removed, and the emblematic keys were substituted in its stead? If his studies had lain amongst the antiquities of Rome, might he not as readily have proved that Christianity was nothing else but the product of Roman mythology? We accept the facts but draw a different conclusion. We see the Kingdom of CHRIST dislodging the old superstitions and appropriating to itself all that was grand and beautiful, dethroning the ensigns of heathendom, and planting the standard of the Cross in their stead.

Alexandria was the chief city of Christian learning, and therefore we need not wonder if a knowledge of Egyptian Mythology was carried into all parts of Christendom. Figures might be drawn from thence; but this does not prove Mr. Sharpe's assertion. We ourselves heard not many days ago the torments of Prometheus used to describe the future punishment of the wicked, but yet we did not for a moment suppose that the preacher, who was a calvinist of the strictest sect, derived his theology from the legends of Greece. S. Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, calls our Blessed LORD "the good scarabæus who rolled up before him the hitherto unshapen mud of our own bodies," thus giving to Him one of the names and characters of the god Horus who is pictured as a scarabæus with a ball of mud placed between his feet."—Nothing, we assert is proved hereby, more than that S. Ambrose did not disdain to use as a Christian parable, a figure taken from Egyptian sculpture to teach the Christian doctrine of the regeneration of mankind.

And now we have done. Mr. Sharpe has endeavoured to cast discredit on Christianity. That so much learning is pressed into so unworthy a cause, is a melancholy fact; but that so learned a Socinian can advance no better arguments is a subject for congratulation. We have nothing to fear from an examination of the monumental antiquities of Egypt. Sir Henry Rawlinson has shown how powerfully they witness to the truth of Scripture his-

tory; and Mr. Sharpe has proved that all arguments which can be derived from thence against Catholic Christianity are weak, empty and delusive. We recommend him to let his researches take a wider range,—for we do not impeach his honesty,—and then we think he will find cause to modify in some degree the conclusions which he has advanced with such unblushing boldness.

THE RITES OF BURIAL.

“THE end of funeral duties is, first, to show that love towards the party deceased which nature requireth; then, to do him that honour which is fit both generally for man, and particularly for the quality of his person; last of all, to testify the care which the Church hath to comfort the living, and the hope which we all have concerning the resurrection of the dead.”¹ Of the three motives or intentions here specified by Hooker regarding religious uses in the burial of the dead, the ancient Christian offices, it is evident, had respect principally to affection for and reverence towards the deceased person; the modern, among ourselves, almost exclusively, to the comfort and instruction of surviving relatives and friends. This marked difference, though natural enough and easily accounted for, points out not only a chief defect in our present office, but also the probably downward tendency of the recent movement for a further change. The object seems to be, to strike out whatever is personal or individual in the application of Christian hope, and to reduce the service to an expression of vague belief in the general resurrection; as if thereby to avoid pronouncing judgment on the particular deceased. The expedient however, is a mere delusion, and does not meet the contemplated difficulty, except so far as it destroys the whole meaning and reality of the service. The association of the truth of a general resurrection with the memory of the deceased individual implies a conscious hope of his personal interest in the fact and consequence of the resurrection; otherwise the mention of the reality of it at that moment were a very mockery of sorrow. In truth, refusal of hope is pronouncing judgment on the individual. Not to despair is to hope; and surely we ought not to despair in a matter where God’s infinite mercy is concerned, and where we are altogether ignorant of qualifying circumstances. Each one standeth or falleth to his own Master; it is a plain Christian duty to hope the best possible concerning him; and Christian sympathy and charity dictate the expression of the hope. Such, even as regards surviving friends, is the rationale of a burial service. “Take away these prayers,

¹ Eccles. Pol. Book V. chap. lxxv.

praises, and holy lessons," writes Hooker in the same chapter, "which were ordained to show at burials the peculiar hope of the Church concerning the resurrection of the dead; and in the manner of the dumb funerals, what one thing is there, whereby the world may perceive that we are Christians?"¹

But we must go on further than this, and remark that the nature and reason of the thing require the commendation to God's mercy, and the special prayers for the deceased, which form so distinguishing a feature in the ancient offices. The lack of these we consider the principal and a very serious defect in our present service. To hope for the best possible, is to *wish* for it; to wish, for a Christian, finds its proper expression in a form of prayer. In this, as in every other subject, of course, accordance with God's will is a condition of effectual prayer. God's will is already and has from eternity been determined about every future act of His Providence; but this truth in no degree affects the promised acceptableness of prayer. And if not in other subjects, why as regards God's dealings with the souls of the deceased? Rather, reason would lead us to conclude that the determination of the divine counsels in all subjects would from eternity have had respect to the "much avail" of effectual fervent prayers and other qualifying circumstances. There is but little force then in the objection which some orthodox Anglican divines have made in defence of our present office, that it is exempt from what even Bishop Mant has called "vainly repeated and ridiculous petitions for the dead, whose doom is already certain."² The first Prayer Book of Edward VI. contains many such forms of reiterated commendation and petition.

"I commend thy soul to GOD the FATHER Almighty, and thy body to the ground, earth to earth," &c.³ "We commend into Thy hands of mercy (most merciful FATHER) the soul of this our brother departed, N. And his body we commit to the earth, beseeching Thine infinite goodness, to give us grace to live in Thy fear and love, and to die in Thy favour: that when the judgment shall come, which Thou hast committed to Thy well-beloved Son, *both this our brother* and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and receive that blessing," &c.⁴ "Almighty God, we give Thee hearty thanks for this Thy servant, whom Thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wretched world, and from the body of death and all temptation. And as we trust, hast brought his soul which he committed into Thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest. Grant, we beseech Thee, that at the day of judgment *his soul* and all the souls of Thy elect, departed out of this life, may with us and we with them, fully receive Thy promises, and be

¹ Book v. ch. lxxv. ad finem.

² Mant's Book of Common Prayer; note on the Order for the Burial of the Dead.

³ From Keeling's *Liturgia Britannica*.

⁴ *Ibid.*

made perfect altogether through the glorious resurrection of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST our LORD. *Priest.* Enter not (O LORD) into judgment with Thy servant. *Answer.* For in Thy sight no living creature shall be justified. *Pr.* From the gates of hell. *Ans.* Deliver their souls, O LORD. *Pr.* I believe to see the goodness of the LORD. *Ans.* In the land of the living. *Pr.* O LORD, graciously hear my prayer. *Ans.* And let my cry come unto Thee."¹ "O LORD, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead: and in whom the souls of them that be elected, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, be in joy and felicity: grant unto this Thy servant, *that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where there is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness:* and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, *make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible; set him on the right hand of Thy Son Jesus Christ, among Thy holy and elect,* that then we may hear with them these most sweet and comfortable words: Come to Me, ye blessed," &c.²

Substantially the same prayer is repeated in the collect appointed in "the celebration of the Holy Communion when there is a burial of the dead," as ordered in the Prayer Book of 1549.³ But "whatever in that book," says Wheatly, "related directly and immediately to the dead was all thrown out of the second liturgy, at the instance of Calvin and his old friend Bucer;"⁴ a strange inconsistency, however, for any who, holding Calvinistic opinions of predestination and indefectibility of grace, do not yet scruple to pray for the elect and reprobate upon earth, "whose doom is already certain," in their uncertainty who are elect and who are not! The same principle, we assert, would fully justify the most unreserved and absolute petitions for the dead, which indeed have been practised and recommended by our most catholic divines.⁵

¹ Keeling's *Liturgiæ Britannicæ*.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Wheatly on Common Prayer, Order for Burial of Dead.

⁵ E.g., Bishop Cosin's Devotions, "Prayers at the Hour of Death;" "*These to be repeated until the soul be departed. Then, O Thou Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant him Thy peace. O LORD, with whom do live the spirits of them that die; and by whom the souls of Thy servants, after they be delivered from the burden of this flesh, be in perpetual joy and felicity; we most meekly beseech Thee for this Thy servant, that having now received the absolution from all his sins which he hath committed in this world, he may escape the gates of hell, and the pain of eternal darkness; that he may for ever dwell with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the region of light and Thy blessed Presence, where there is neither weeping nor heaviness; and that when the dreadful day of the general judgment shall come, he may rise again with the just, and receive this dead body which must now be buried in the earth, to be joined with his soul, and be made pure and incorruptible for ever after, in Thy glorious kingdom, for the merits of Thy dear SON, our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Amen.*"

On the other hand it must be confessed that rigidly interpreted some of the language employed in the earlier Offices of Burial does *seem* to imply an erroneous theology on the condition of the Christian dead. It is not surprising, therefore, as we hinted, that under the influence of the foreign Protestants the prayers and suffrages we have quoted should have been abolished, and our Office reduced to its present mutilated and more meagre forms. So far as hope indeed implies desire, and desire prayer, the expression of hope, as it stands at present, substantially includes a prayer for the individual departed. This fact is a contradiction to the strange boast of some of our Anglican liturgicists that direct and immediate reference to the deceased party is purposely excluded from the Prayer Book. It explains too the sacred ground on which the would-be revisionists of the Order of Burial are treading when they tamper so lightly with the phrases of an inherited ritual, as if no deeper meaning than the most obvious and superficial were involved in them, and that so far as doctrine was concerned they may be indifferently omitted or retained. The truth is, there is no part of theology on which we commonly have a more defective apprehension than as regards the condition of souls in the intermediate state. In dread of the prohibited dogma imputed to certain *Romanenses* concerning Purgatory, the policy of our divines recently has been to ignore the whole question, and we cannot be said to hold any popular definite doctrine on the subject. Hence too the apparent hesitancy of our ritual forms. But surely a very first condition precedent to a revision of the present Office ought to be a clear and distinct apprehension of the state and capability of deceased souls. A want of definiteness on the subject must practically obscure and perplex the question; and it has moreover been long felt by earnest and sensitive minds among us as a serious defect in Anglican theology.

It will be sufficient for our present purpose, without entering on disputable doctrinal questions, simply to state a few chief truisms regarding the present condition of the Christian dead in which we believe all Catholic teachers are agreed. The soul, on its separation from the body, enters consciously on the intermediate state; of which the parable, or history, of Dives and Lazarus, is the clearest Scripture illustration. At death the time of probation and discipline comes utterly to an end; God's Book of Remembrance is finally settled and irrevocable; there is no longer any possibility of further salvatory grace or penitence; a particular judgment is passed on every individual soul; its final doom is fixed; so also its capacity for sanctity and bliss; it can make no further progress in spiritual capability. This seems to be the meaning of the Scripture saying about the tree lying where it falls, and there being no work or place of repentance in the grave. Still the souls of the elect, dying in grace, do not enter at once into full possession of

their happiness and glory. They are capable of increases of spiritual light, rest, peace, joy, as compared with their present actual condition. On the other hand, God's justice may exact some positive penal retribution proportioned to the guilt of their past sins, which the prayers of the faithful may avail to mitigate or remove. He may not so pardon, but that He may also punish, as happened to David, and is ordinarily the case in this life. Such temporal punishment surely is the legitimate subject of prayer. But not so a reversal of the final doom, as if God would after death still blot out pages of His Book of Remembrance, and make fresh entries in His Book of Life. As the Apostle writes with a decisive severity, "There is a sin unto death, I do not say that ye should pray for it." It is not strictly orthodox or logical to use such prayers, (though reasonable as a natural instinct); nor such phrases as "*progressive sanctity*," or "*corrective punishment*" in the intermediate state, as if the spiritual growth and capacity of each soul were not yet completed. The punishment is *judicium ultionis*,—a punitive rather than a purifying process; a cleansing from the guilt, the *vincula*, the *macula*, the *reatus*, rather than from the moral effect upon the soul of actual sins; a saving so as by fire; a beating with many or few stripes.

This is a brief, but we believe so far as it goes, a correct summary of Catholic doctrine on the subject. If the Prayer Book be the embodiment and expression of the instinctive aspirations of the saints, and "the voice of the congregation," it may without detriment to this primary idea, and as we think, ought to be modified so as to meet these truths. It is not surprising that the hard-headed foreign Reformers took exception to some of the seemingly illogical phrases retained from earlier sources in the Office of 1549, which *seemed* to imply the possibility of a remission of eternal punishment to any who died reprobate; "*seemed*" we say with emphasis, though as already asserted, capable of a Catholic interpretation. The mistake was in striking out and not modifying exceptionable expressions relative to the departed; except so far as the "hope" of the present Office necessarily implies prayer. Some of the beautiful old suffrages or antiphons, whether defining or leaving undefined the particular blessing contemplated, might well have been introduced. We can perceive no sound objection on the score of orthodoxy, but the very strongest claim on that of Christian charity to the use of such general ejaculations as "Jesu, mercy," "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O LORD;" or such more definite forms as the "*Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine; et perpetua lux luceat eis*," "*Requiescat in pace*." The popular objection most probably would be their use in the Roman Missal, and *Officium de Exequiis Defunctorum*; as if we thereby committed ourselves by implication to the prohibited dogmas of Purgatory and Indulgences; a kind of objection which would apply

of course equally to the Anglican recognition of the Real Presence, as if necessarily intending Transubstantiation; and to all Catholic doctrine embodied in the Prayer Book.

On the other hand the surest hope of re-union between the externally severed Churches is to show their internal agreement in every essential point of doctrine, and so far as they have already attained to an acknowledgment of the common faith, to walk by the same rule, and mind the same things. One lamentable consequence of our own doctrinal indefiniteness and ritual indecision as regards the state of souls in the intermediate state has been the practical abeyance amongst us of all prayer for the faithful departed: which though theoretically recognised by formal legal judgment (in the case of *Woolfrey v. the Vicar of Carisbrooke*) certainly evinces no sign of having taken hold of the popular religious mind. Perhaps on no single point of practical theology does the Church of England as compared with other branches of the Catholic Church stand at more painful disadvantages than on this, of prayers for the dead. Persons themselves very far distant from Roman proclivities,¹ have pointed out this as one of the most stirring influences towards scepticism in that direction.

We ourselves have known some equally loyal in their attachment to the English Church, deeply moved by the touching appeal so commonly engraved on tombstones of all classes dying in that communion, "Of thy charity pray for the soul of ——" and the unavoidable conviction that such special prayers will be wanting in good measure to themselves. Is there not reason moreover to conclude that very much of the prevailing infidelity regarding eternal punishment is owing to defective theology on this subordinate point?

The above appear to us sufficiently conclusive reasons against tampering with our Burial Office in the present unprepared disposition of the popular religious mind. The doctrinal aspect of the subject is comparatively new to all of us and needs discussion; and there are manifold signs both in and out of Parliament, that the discussion is likely soon to be forced upon us, and we trust it will eventuate in the same well-defined enunciation of the Catholic truth and practice in the matter as has happened in the sacramental and ritual questions which have been raised and settled amongst us of late years. The practical aspect has in other cases generally taken precedence of the theological; and so in this. The improved order and decency of our churchyards; the more Christian character of tombstones and other monuments of the dead; the planting flowers and placing wreaths of "immortelles" on graves; the restored use of biers and embroidered pall; the chiming of bells at burials; the multiplication of choral funerals;

¹ E.g. the Rev. Archer Gurney, whose late pamphlet on the subject, though not theologically trustworthy, is most commendable for its bold and zealous advocacy of the practice in question.

the establishment of Burial Guilds to assist in the expense¹ and carrying out of these rites; and especially, a more frequent celebration of Holy Communion at burials² (as provided for with a special office in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. and in Queen Elizabeth's Latin Prayer Book); all evidence an increasing reverence amongst us in the treatment of the sacred dead; though directed chiefly, it is probable, to the bodies rather than the souls of departed Christians, as temples of the HOLY GHOST, and to faith in the blessed truth of the general resurrection, rather than to a hopeful regard of their spiritual condition in the intermediate state, as still "living unto God." But this latter, and certainly not least important portion of a very difficult subject is beginning to open upon us, and is already ripe for ventilation. We could wish that one of the more Catholic-minded and patristic of our living theologians would anticipate and direct the general discussion with some specific and explicit statement of the true doctrine. A suggestion of certain topics needing a more competent solution than we have here attempted, has been the main purpose of the present Article. The political objections to altering the Burial Office,—such as letting "the thin edge of the wedge" of liturgical revision into the Prayer Book,—have been amply treated in contemporary periodicals, and we do not care to repeat the stock arguments and explanations which have been over and over again advanced in defence of the office as it stands. Least of all should we be forward to follow in the wake of a community which has evinced so little theological perception of the doctrine of the intermediate state as to bracket the article of the descent into hell in the Apostles' Creed. The American Prayer Book simply submits to the objections of the Puritans, and disclaims the answer of the Bishops, at the Conference of the Savoy, by expunging all the expressions of Christian hope in the office relating to the deceased person.³ These expressions, as we have en-

¹ "Funeral doles were an ancient custom. *Chrys. Hom.* 32 in Matt." Bp. Sparrow, *Rationale*, &c. p. 309. We may add, Burial of the Dead is one of the stated acts of Corporal Mercy.

² "It was an ancient custom after the burial to go to the Holy Communion, unless the office were performed after noon. For then, if men were not fasting, it was done only with prayers. *Conc. Carth.* 3, 29 *Can.*" Ibid.

³ Puritan objections,— "These words (pleased Almighty God to take unto Himself, &c.) cannot in truth be said of persons living and dying in open and notorious sin." Also "the words, we give Thee hearty thanks, &c. may harden the wicked and are inconsistent with the largest rational charity." Also "That when we depart this life, we may—as our hope is this our brother, &c. cannot be said with respect to persons who have not by actual repentance given any ground for the hope of their blessed estate."

Answer of the Bishops.— "We see not why these words may not be said of any person whom we dare not say is damned, and it were a breach of charity to say so even of those whose repentance we do not see; for whether they do not inwardly and heartily repent at the last hour, even at the last act, who knows? and that God will not even then pardon them upon such repentance, who dares say? It is better to be charitable, and hope the best, than rashly to condemn." From Cardwell's "History of Conferences."

deavoured to show, are the one remaining link which unites our own modern with the earlier and more Catholic offices, which, little enough as it is, we can least of all spare from it, as also the one voice of loving communion with the faithful departed. It is absurd, then, to contend for some such alteration of the service on the ground that no change of doctrine is involved,¹ when the most important theological differences are implied in it. Such an alteration would in truth be another and finishing step downwards in the ultra-protestant direction.

In urging this objection, however, we are by no means insensible to the existence of a scandal in the use of the office over persons who have lived and died in notorious sin, impenitent. This, however, is altogether a different question, and must be considered on totally distinct grounds. The proper remedy cannot be in the mutilation of the Christian ritual, or its reduction to an un-Christian standard, but in the regulation of its use so as to exclude all persons who have practically excommunicated themselves, and are unworthy of any Christian privilege. It is beside our purpose now to suggest any particular measure with this object. But in plain and extreme instances (and none others cause much scandal) we can see no reason why any greater practical difficulty should exist than in the case of refusing such offenders the Blessed Sacrament. Due notice to the ordinary might similarly be required; and (as was suggested by the venerable Bishop of Exeter) necessary submission to his censure would be a sufficient check upon a rash or malicious abuse of the discretion. But this, we repeat, is altogether a different question, and should be kept quite distinct from that of altering the office. Of the present office, though defective in the expression of full and hearty sympathy with the departed, as compared with ancient models, we can still say with Bishop Sparrow, "By all which prayers, praises, and holy lessons, and decent solemnities, we do glorify God, *honour the dead*, and comfort the living."² The sole object of the proposed change is to cease honouring all the Christian dead, lest persons not deserving honour should receive it.

¹ Vide Letter of Rev. C. E. Kennaway in *Guardian* of July 22 last.

² *Rationale*, p. 307.

BROMBY'S CHURCH STUDENTS' MANUAL.

Church Students' Manual. By the Rev. C. H. BROMBY, M.A.,
Principal of the Normal College, Cheltenham. Edinburgh : A.
and C. Black.

It would be unreasonable of course to expect advanced Churchmanship from Cheltenham, or any of its institutions. The Dean of Carlisle, when Vicar of Cheltenham, evinced great sagacity, and a wider range of thought than belongs ordinarily to his party, in establishing both a Proprietary School for the Sons of Gentry, and also a Training School for parish Schoolmasters, both of which, in their way, have been eminently successful. And it was their success which led also to the establishment, in the same place, though not we believe directly by himself, of the Ladies' College, which has answered equally well.

But Mr. Close had from the first a considerable difficulty to contend with in the selection of masters. "It is not easy," he is reported to have said apologetically, to a friend who found fault with the appointments, "it is not easy to find a pious Christian (i.e. of course, in his own sense of the term,) who is also a good scholar," and so he was obliged to get help from whence he could. At the head of the school, if we remember right, there was for a long time a layman who did not profess any very definite religious views. A Low Church successor was indeed afterwards found; but a mutiny among the proprietors soon occurred, and the patronage is now vested in a committee, which has no special theological bias. In order to find a Principal for the Normal College, we believe that Mr. Close was obliged to resort to Dr. Stowe's Presbyterian establishment at Glasgow. This latter gentleman, if we mistake not, is now the Rev. C. H. Bromby, in the orders—we infer—of the Church of England, whose book is before us.

Knowing these antecedents of the author and his position, we did not look certainly for a high standard of Churchmanship, nor for much learning; but we did hope for something like fairness. Our complaint is, that the book is altogether unfair, as we proceed now to show.

It is impossible for a moment to doubt that the whole object of the book is to guard persons against taking the Prayer Book in its natural sense. With this purpose in view, on one occasion, Mr. Bromby goes the length of directly contradicting the Prayer Book. It occurs in the chapter on the Catechism, where we read,

"The expression, 'we are hereby made,' and the corresponding one, 'wherein we were made children of God,' are used in a declarative

sense. Baptism is the legal instrument by which we are installed into those privileges. We do not, however, become 'children of God' because we are baptised, but we are baptised because we are children of God."—P. 110.

More generally, the end is gained by less direct means—which however, we must add, are even more dishonest. Thus, the accession of Elizabeth to the throne is handled in this manner :

"After the death of Mary, and the restoration of Protestantism, one of the first questions which beset Elizabeth was whether the reformed Church should adopt the first or second book of Edward. This naturally arose from the arrest which the reformation received in the reign of Mary. The result, however, of the discussion was not only the adoption but *revision* of the second book of King Edward."—P. 15.

Now if words mean any thing, it is here implied that Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book was an advance in the Protestant direction upon Edward's second book, which we can only designate as most barefaced falsehood.

In a similarly audacious spirit, the changes introduced in 1604 are misrepresented by Mr. Bromby. Thus he states :

"A.D. 1604, the same year in which 'the Canons' were collected by Bishop Bancroft, the Hampton Court Conference was held in compliance with the king's commission. The alterations consisted in qualifying the *absolute* necessity of baptism held by Rome, by the expression '*generally necessary*,' contained in the latter division of the Catechism upon the doctrine of the Sacraments, which was now for the first time appended."—P. 17.

Mr. Bromby of course well knows that the addition of the last part of the Catechism at the Hampton Court Conference was a most thoroughly Catholic rectification of the Church of England. But he introduces the fact almost by the way, laying the chief stress on the introduction of the word "generally." But here are two *implicit* misrepresentations ; for first, his words seem to imply that before that date the Sacraments were said to be "absolutely" necessary to salvation. And secondly, we should think that he must, notwithstanding his Scotch education, have sufficient acquaintance with logic, to know that the word "generally," really enhances, if it be possible, the absoluteness of the Sacraments' necessity, for it affirms that they are necessary for the whole *genus*, man, and consequently for every individual member of Adam's family. Again, it is very distinctly stated, that the commemoration of the faithful departed was omitted in Edward's second book ; but the restored mention of them in 1662 is thus ingeniously glossed over. "The last clause of the Prayer¹ of (*sic*),

¹ We do not know if we are to include this amongst the misprints, of which there is a large crop, the result, we apprehend, of the book being printed in Presbyterian Scotland.

the Church Militant was revised." We add a few more of a like tendency, taken almost at hazard.

1. The first exhortation in the Communion Service, which Mr. Bromby calls "*The Hortatory Prayer*," is said to require "self-examination, &c.," and concludes by enforcing (1) "a full trust in God's mercy," and (2) a "quiet conscience." This is Mr. Bromby's *dodge* (we can only use a vulgar word to describe a vulgar trick) for getting over the direction that persons troubled in mind should seek counsel and absolution from a priest!

2. The value of the Catechism, as the great expounder of dogma, is made light of by a theory which we believe to be original.

"The Church Catechism is a beautiful, useful, but much misunderstood summary of Christian truth. The writers of it did not so much intend that children who had been by baptism admitted into the Church should commit it to memory, as that the clergy and parents might be guided in their explanation of the baptismal covenant, and of their duties and obligations which arise out of it."—P. 82.

3. At p. 57 we have a marvellous instance of the way in which Protestants deceive themselves by quoting the letter of Holy Scripture. Mr. Bromby is vindicating the place of the Commandments in the Communion Service, and is good enough to say that the moral law is of some use, as being "a schoolmaster to bring us to CHRIST!" This is indeed "the letter that killeth!"

4. But Mr. Bromby reserves his greatest displays of sophistry for the occasions when he is called to speak of the priesthood, which he strives by every conceivable artifice to divest of a sacramental or authoritative character, so that literally, in one place, he takes lower ground than a Presbyterian, putting not only Priests, but Deacons, on a level with Bishops. This shall be our final quotation.

"When the Apostles were absent upon their Apostolic journeys, judging from the example of S. Paul, [he does not tell us where the example is to be met with,] we find that they delegated the office of Ordaining to Presbyters (the word is contracted into Priests) and *Deacons* in every city."

Such is the honesty of Cheltenham theology in her Church of England Training College! The chapter on the History of the English Church, is simply an attack upon Rome.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Proposed Surrender of the Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England. A Letter to the Lord Bishop of London on Professor Stanley's Views on Clerical and University Subscription. By W. J. IRONS, D.D., Prebendary of S. Paul's, and Incumbent of Brompton, Middlesex. London: Thomas Wright, 188, Strand.

A WRITER need scarcely wish an easier task than to answer Dr. Stanley as to matter of fact. Unfortunately Dr. Stanley's power does not depend on facts at all, but in falling in with the popular self-sufficiency and impatience of restraint. Nevertheless there ought to be an exposure of the Professor's mis-statements, and this office Dr. Irons has discharged with sufficient success; and in his answer appeals with a confidence which we are sure the public sense of the Church will abundantly justify to the deliberate convictions of the nation. It is, we believe, quite a mistake to imagine, that the laity desire to unsettle the foundations of belief. On the contrary, they complain that there is already too much division among the Clergy; and although they have grown up in a suspicious and jealous temper of mind, and would, therefore, scrutinise any legislative measures with some amount of distrust, yet upon the whole they feel the need of increased, rather than of diminished organization. For ourselves we have never yet heard of any one who was kept out of the ministry of the Church of England by the necessity of Subscription; and we are quite certain that, if there were such persons, they would not be worth having. But this is a matter of opinion.

The statement of Dr. Stanley that the Reformation age was more liberal than the present admits of the most direct historical refutation. If the Reformers, both here and on the continent, did not require Subscription, it was only because they had not worked out their intended Code of Discipline. But meanwhile they went much farther: they burnt and tortured those who ventured to differ from them. Their intolerance is a matter of notoriety, and we are surprised that Dr. Irons does not allude more immediately to the fact.

Equally absurd it is in Dr. Stanley to claim the primitive age as being with him. Tests are in their origin of course the result of heresy: but it was the heresy and not jealousy for the Truth, that was the novelty. The Apostolic Epistles abound in precepts designed for the purpose of guarding the Truth against Free-thinkers of all kinds: the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed are not one whit stronger than those of S. Paul and S. John.

Dr. Irons appeals however rather, and we must say most triumphantly, to the sub-Apostolic age.

"And here I would remark, my Lord, on the obvious difference between a state of the Church in which there was a system of Discipline holding together the whole body, and a condition like our own, when Discipline is acknowledged to be extinct among us. When Bishops met together periodi-

cally, as they then did, to regulate the affairs of the Church—and stood in mutual awe of each other's spiritual powers;—when dismissal from Communion was a chastisement shrunk from, by laity and clergy, with terror,—it might have been easy to do without such Subscriptions as now attempt to guard the orthodoxy of our people. So again in the Pre-Reformation Church; the organization of the hierarchy, and the necessary submission of the people, might often render Subscriptions more than superfluous—intelligible. Let those who would take away the present Subscription to our Prayer Book, restore to us, in a fair measure, the active Discipline of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic times, and I for one will thankfully hail the change. But to ask to return to the 'first three centuries,'—bristling as they do with canons, synodical and episcopal letters, and declarations,—because a volume was not then presented for the signature of every candidate for Orders,—is as reasonable as it would be to propose now to abolish printing, and go back to the simplicity and 'freedom' of oral instruction and the scantiest of manuscript literature. There is no fallacy more glittering, but none more unworthy, illogical, and self-condemning than that of false historical parallel. And I again must ask your Lordship, whether Dr. Stanley's appeal to the Primitive History has not wholly failed? I have briefly shown that Constantine was not the originator of Subscriptions to creeds or canons, but that subscribing or professing dogmatic assent was a Christian custom of the earlier ages. It is plain to every one who knows the history, *e.g.*, of a great Bishop like S. Cyprian or S. Irenæus, or of a great writer like Tertullian or Origen, that to guard dogmatically against heresy, by every means in their power, was the predominating idea of their whole course, however imperfectly attained; and they would have been utterly astounded if anyone had foretold in a future age of the Church, when all Discipline had been destroyed among CHRIST's people, a Professor of History would appeal to *their* example as a justification of the proposal to excuse all ministers of CHRIST from signing any Articles of Faith."—Pp. 20—22.

We regret to be obliged to add that Dr. Irons is scarcely a fair controversialist. Of four opprobrious terms applied to Subscription which he quotes as from Dr. Stanley, the Professor is not justly chargeable with one. Two occur in quotations from other writers, and the remaining two are not the actual expressions of his individual opinion. If the pamphlet reach another edition, we should strongly advise the cancelling of this and a few other passages.

Science and Scripture. By JOHN RADFORD YOUNG, formerly Professor of Mathematics in Belfast College. Lockwood and Co.

THE object of this book is to discuss the difficulties which Science has raised against Scripture in many important points, and especially in the account of the Creation, by Moses. It was, the Author says, chiefly suggested to him by the wide circulation of the "Essays and Reviews;" and he states, in his "Introductory Remarks," his intention of confining himself almost entirely to the purely scientific difficulties, and not to attempt as a layman to meddle with those other matters, exclusively connected with ecclesiastical economy, which occupy a considerable portion of the volume to which he alludes.

Mr. Young's book is, doubtless, well-meant, and so far as he adheres to his resolution of not meddling with theological subjects, well exe-

cuted. The scientific difficulties are answered in a scientific manner, very clearly proving that Science, instead of opposing Scripture statements, supports them. We regret that he should have departed from his original intention, and have attempted to discuss points of doctrine, upon which he is evidently ignorant. And we most unhesitatingly condemn his conclusions thereupon as heretical; and, further, as inconsistent with his own previous statements and opinions. For example, he says, in page 136, that "a limited Omnipotence is a contradiction;" and in speaking of miracles, "They are explicable by no physical science, simply because they are without the dominion of physical laws, and therefore not amenable to their authority." And further in page 185, he says, in speaking of Bishop Colenso's difficulties, "A mere child would know that, by whatever philosophy supernatural phenomena were to be investigated, it could not, at any rate, be natural philosophy."

Again, in page 187:

"It would be a ridiculous absurdity to pit the laws of intellectless material nature against the irresistible will and wisdom of Omnipotence. . . . If the will of God can originate—if He can control or stop the movements of the matter He has created, only just as the will of man can originate, or control, or stop the matter he carries about with him—if He can do this only, on what justifiable ground is the possibility of His arresting 'even the earth to be denied?'"

And once more, he quotes against him a contemporary of Professor Powell, and "one who ranks considerably higher on the roll of scientific names."

"Sans doute, dans les sciences qu'on nomme naturelles, la seule methode qu'on puisse employer avec succès consiste à observer les faits et à soumettre ensuite les observations au calcul. Mais ce serait une erreur grave de penser qu'on ne trouve la certitude que dans les démonstrations géométriques, ou dans le témoignage des sens. . . . Soyons donc persuadés qu'il existe des vérités autres que les vérités de l'algèbre, des réalités autres que les objets sensibles."—*Cauchy, Cours d'Analyse*, p. 5.

After these, and many other passages of a like nature, Mr. Young himself ventures upon far higher ground: and in attempting "to meddle with" the mysteries of the Divine Will and Power, limits that will and power, if not to natural laws, at least to the finite comprehension of the human understanding. He attempts a subject placed by Omnipotence Himself entirely out of the range of human intellect, and after misrepresenting the doctrine of which he speaks, he affirms, in page 199, that it "is impossible, even with God," and argues coolly of what he calls the "supernaturally impossible"! As long as he keeps to physical science, and opposes the natural difficulties of Professor Powell, Bishop Colenso, and others, he is successful; but so soon as he "pits himself against the irresistible will and power of Omnipotence" he fails, because he gets upon ground over which the intellect of man was never intended to range. After asking Mr. Young the question, How he accounts for the Omnipresence of God? we will conclude this subject by bringing his own arguments against him, in the two quotations following:

"That genuine science will ever prove adverse to Revelation, there is no fear; that it will ever penetrate its mysteries, there is no hope; for these are the deep and inscrutable problems of Him, 'in Whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.' (Coloss. ii. 3.)"—P. 131.

"The Bible declares that man was made in the image of God. The most unmistakable feature in that image is man's intelligent will, as displayed in his power to coerce matter, in his power to lay his hand upon it, to disturb its natural repose, to convert its rest into motion, and to mould and fashion it as he wills, though he is constituted to do this only within certain limits. Yet one would think that a contemplation merely of the wonders which the human will has called up around us, would suffice to make us careful not to too much limit the power of the Divine Will, even if God were made in the image of man—that is, even if we could conceive of the Supreme Being as no more than a vastly exalted type of the human."—P. 189.

Life and Work in Newfoundland. Reminiscences of Thirteen Years spent there. By the Rev. JULIAN MORETON, Colonial Chaplain at Labuan, late Missionary at Greenspond, Newfoundland. London: Rivingtons.

THE contents of this volume were first delivered as an Address in several parishes in England; and the simple, unselfish statement of facts, the humble record of the difficulties, and the truthful and grateful picture of the encouragement of a missionary's life, cannot fail to produce interest both in the author and his work.

The danger of the climate, the description of the people, their habits, language, simplicity, and ignorance, are all vividly pictured, without any attempt at effect—in which perhaps lies the chief charm of the book. It was prepared for the press "amid the discomforts and interruptions of a sea voyage," which the author states as an apology for the faults of composition, which he modestly infers may be found in it. "The entire break down of his health," says the Preface, "and the weak constitution of one of his children determined Mr. Moreton, for a time at least, to give up missionary work in the trying climate of Newfoundland." As a specimen of the grateful spirit in which Mr. Moreton writes in the difficulties we will give one extract.

"Scarcely any one of the many inconveniences which arise to the inhabitants of such places is more painful, than the want of ground of sufficient extent and suitable for the burial of the dead. An old graveyard in Greenspond, now no longer used, had certainly sufficient depth of swamp for the purpose, but it was upon the water's edge, and the ice, which in winter formed upon its banks, foundered in large masses in the spring of every year, and carried with it into the sea portions of the soil, till at length many graves were wholly lost. I have seen there three coffins open at one time, their mouldering contents being washed away by the tide. My predecessor in the mission made much effort to correct, as far as possible, this sad and painful outrage upon human feeling, by procuring a new burial-ground, the best, I believe, that could be got. But where this had depth, the graves when dug were in a very short time nearly filled with water. The water was baled out when at the time of a funeral the corpse was brought to the grave; but I have seen the coffin of an adult person float and careen before the prayers were ended. Where this ground was dug, it was shoal, or was bare rock only, and sods of turf had to be brought in to build a grave above the natural surface.

Once I remember burying a corpse, by laying it upon the rock above ground to be walled in and covered. It was not very uncommon for a dug-grave to be less in depth than the coffin.

"There are yet worse evils attached to these ill situated habitations The simultaneous calls and requirements of widely separated places in my mission were often most perplexing and painful to me; so much so, that I sometimes dreaded to go outside my house, lest I should meet persons then in Greenspond on some business, who would intreat me to go forthwith, or name a time for going a voyage to their distant places, while my duties in other stations were claiming my presence.

"The visits of a clergyman are really and earnestly desired and valued by the poor secluded dwellers upon these isolated places, and their words of regret, and sometimes reproach, for the infrequency of my visits, were truly touching and hard to be borne. No less affecting was the gentleness and consideration of some who, in every way, proved their value for my ministrations; and for such meagre service as I could render them, they were truly thankful and cheerfully forward to serve me in return. None but myself could well know what manifold cares and occupations my charge imposed upon me, and one fears it must have seemed in the sight of the flock, a scant and unloving regard which brought me to some of my stations but thrice or twice, or even once in twelve months. Some places, alas! remained even longer unvisited."

This Mission to Greenspond to which Mr. Moreton was appointed, was the largest in the diocese of Newfoundland. It extended along seventy miles of coast, and needed a journey of two hundred miles to visit its stations in one circuit—there being twenty-three distinct places, each requiring distinct visits and ministrations.

A Catechism on Confirmation, (G. J. Palmer,) is, of course, like all the series "edited by a Committee of Clergymen," substantially orthodox and Catholic. There are one or two points, however, in which it might be amended. 1. It is not well to say that the object of going to Confirmation is "not merely to renew our vows, but," &c., because this seems to admit that the renewal of vows is the *chief* object. 2. The "flesh" is not the body of man, but his old unregenerate nature, consisting both of mind and body. 3. We should have wished to see some recommendation to the candidate for going to the Priest for counsel and absolution. 4. There is a misprint of chapter "13" in the Acts of the Apostles for chapter 8.

Archdeacon COXE's Charge, entitled *Free Enquiry: its Claims and Tendencies*, (Rivingtons,) contains some very sensible home-truths. Especially we are glad to see that he notices one reason why Oxford is at this time not so full as one could wish. The way of increasing it, he justly says,

"will never be discovered by showing further slight to the faith which the people love. Rather let the men of Oxford be well assured, that many a parent withholds from them his son through fear of exposing him to the deadly perils which must beset him in that which is now the very centre of licentious speculation. While many more, who have kith and kin in the place, are waiting in deep anxiety the hour of their return, trembling lest they bear with them the blotch of the plague, or taint of leprosy! Only they who have known what it is to feel an ardent affection for Oxford, will be able to appreciate the pain of writing thus."

We trust that the goodly list of undergraduate signatures, to what may be called the anti-Stanley petition to Parliament, containing, practically, about nine-tenths of the whole body of resident undergraduates, will tend to reassure parents, by showing them that the boast of the liberal party in the University is altogether false.

We strongly recommend the *Sermon* preached by Mr. CARTER, at "the Whitsun Consecration Festival of All Saints." (Masters.) It is a most deep and devotional survey of the last thirty years, in the history of the English Church, and must tell with all religious minds.

Messrs. Williams and Norgate, we are glad to see, have published the *Cur Deus Homo* of S. Anselm, in its original language, at a very cheap price.

A Village Story for Village Maidens (Masters) is now complete, and may be had either in three separate parts, or in a volume. They evince very accurate acquaintance with character, and with the habits and feelings of girls of the class which supplies our parish-schools.

The Talking Fireirons ; The Oiled Feather ; The Eye-Doctor, by the Rev. P. B. POWER, M.A., (London: Wertheim, Mackintosh and Hunt,) are first-rate tracts, of a most original kind. Instead of the thundering denunciations, or the sickening familiarity of the tracts usually emanating from the school to which their author is said to belong, we find only wholesome practical lessons brought home to the conscience, with a playful satire, which is as winning as it is ingenious. Mr. Power has a keen insight into character as well as genuine humour, and he uses both in these little publications with great skill. They will do more good than a cartload of the sensation type.

Mr. SPENCER ST. JOHN, late Consul in Borneo, has published two interesting volumes of *Life in the Forests of the Far East*, (Smith Elder, and Co.,) which concludes with a chapter on missionary work. There seems a good deal of truth in his remarks; and though they are not altogether favourable to the English Church, we seem to have done very much better than the Roman Catholics, of whose Bishop Mr. St. John gives a very curious account.

The Rev. G. J. BROWN, M.A., Curate of Bladon, Oxon, has completed *A Continuous Commentary on S. John's Gospel*, in two large volumes, (Rivingtons,) which deserve to be spoken of with respect. Its orthodoxy and moderation will commend it to readers who do not look for anything very deep in Holy Scripture.

The Dean of CANTERBURY has also commenced his *English New Testament, with Notes*, to which we may have to revert hereafter. The position of the Dean is curious. He was perhaps the first who gave anything like popularity in this country to that critical theory so common in Germany, which divests the sacred narrative, as much as possible, of what is supernatural or miraculous. Hence it arose that the authors of "Essays and Reviews" naturally claimed him as one of themselves. Dr. Alford, however, took the first opportunity of disavowing all sympathy with those gentlemen. And now he has the dif-

ficult task of nevertheless vindicating his own consistency. This gives a controversial character to the present volume, which is not agreeable, and stirs up many questions that are not edifying to ordinary readers.

The Rev. W. HOUGHTON, who was amongst the first to sound the note of warning on "Rationalism in the Church of England," has published the very thoughtful series of *Essays* which appeared originally in our pages under this head. We do not know any better work to which any person could refer, in order to gain a conspectus of the attack which is now being made upon the faith of England.

The Bishop of BANGOR's *Charge to his Clergy*, (Rivingtons,) is, in the main, an earnest practical exhortation to his Clergy. In the end, however, he is obliged to touch on the "Welsh Services Bill," and his own share in the introduction of it into the House of Lords. We have read the Bishop's apology attentively, and we are sorry to be obliged to say that it shows less of judgment and courage than we could have considered possible.

The Music of S. Mark's College Chapel has been so long famous that we do not wonder Mr. HELMORE should at length have been induced to give it to the public. The collection is very miscellaneous in its character, and probably would not be used *complete* in any other church; but there is much that will be useful in many quarters. It is published by Mr. Masters.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We have received the following, and gladly insert it:

Aberdeen, July 1.

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR,—There is an unintentional mistake at page 221 of the July *Ecclesiastic*. Mr. Wilson's edition is not the first complete copy of the Scotch Office. I last year printed an edition of 2,000, a copy of which I sent to the Editor of the *Ecclesiastic*, though no notice was taken of it, and a duplicate copy of which I likewise transmit with this note. Please to rectify this mistake.

Yours very sincerely,

FREDERICK GEORGE LEE.

THE LIFE OF SAVONAROLA.

The History of Girolamo Savonarola, and of his times. By PASQUALE VILLARI, Professor of History in the University of Pisa. Translated from the Italian by LEONARD HORNER, F.R.S., with the co-operation of the Author. In Two Volumes. London: Longmans. 1863. Pp. 808.

THIS book, whether in its English or in its Italian dress, will take a permanent rank in the first class of biographical histories. If the advice of the *Quarterly Review* (Quart. Review, April 1863) were followed respecting it, and this life of Savonarola were put aside for twenty years, before being submitted to public perusal, it would sustain the ordeal, for it will live for many decades of years. It is a truly classical work, written with the utmost care as to correctness of detail, combined with great moderation of sentiment, and most comprehensive and enlarged views. The extreme admirers of Savonarola, must regard Professor Villari's history, as a monument worthy of the name and fame of him of whom it treats. We very greatly value the book, as filling up a gap in the history of Italy, at the time of her greatest glory and magnificence. In its pages the old Italian cities are opened up to our view with a clearness of expression, that leaves little to be desired; the curtain is withdrawn for a short time from the sittings of the Venetian Republic, and from the Florentine Platonic Academy, so indissolubly associated with the name of Marsilio Ficino. The fact is, that the book was written amongst the scenes which it describes—it is an Italian historian and archæologist of consummate learning, telling a story of what happened amongst his own cities and people in times gone by;—hence the life-like character of all his descriptions. The translator, Mr. Horner, has mingled amongst the same scenes, and caught the same spirit.

The author and the translator have worked together to present to the English reader, a history as perfect and as correct, as that which is now circulating throughout the length and breadth of the Italian peninsula. It was in Florence that Mr. Horner met the Marchese Gino Capponi, to whom he has dedicated his translation, and who, finding him engaged in reading Burlamacchi's Life of Savonarola, said to him, "You must read Villari, a recent work by an able man, the result of ten years' research into original documents, many of which he discovered. It is the first and only work in which full justice has been done to Savonarola." Soon afterwards, Mr. Horner became acquainted with Professor Villari, who being a good English scholar, revised

VOL. XXV.—SEPTEMBER, 1863.

3 F

and encouraged him in his translation, so that he "might feel secure that" he "had always rightly understood his meaning, especially in idiomatic expressions. The translation," he continues, "has been printed since my return to England; each proof sheet has been sent to the author, and returned with his approval and suggested amendments." (Pref. p. x.) Hence the accuracy of the book before us. The author in his preface, gives a summary of all the preceding biographies of Savonarola, from the anonymous Genevan life of 1781, down to his own. Amongst the principal of the lives may be mentioned, that of Barsanti, a Dominican Friar, which appeared at Leghorn in 1783; that of Rudelback of Hamburg, 1835; that of Karl Meier, Berlin, 1836; that of Father Vincent Marchese, a Dominican, Florence, 1855; that of M. Perrens, Paris, 1853; that of Mr. R. Madden, London, 1854, which is so full of mistakes, that Professor Villari says of it, "To Italians, this book is wholly useless; and to foreigners, it conveys the most incorrect ideas." (Pref. p. xxv.) There are two earlier biographies of much value, one the work of Father Burlamacchi, which was published at Lucca in 1764; the other that of Father Pico, which was first published at Paris, in the year 1674. All these authors having written for some party purpose, have endeavoured to present to their readers that side of Savonarola's character, which most accords with their own particular views. Professor Villari, on the other hand, assures his readers that he has no preconceived ideas to maintain.

"We undertook," he writes, "the task, because it appeared to us that Savonarola had played a great part and unacknowledged in that century which concluded the middle ages, and was the dawn of modern civilization, but it never entered into our mind, that the monk of the fifteenth century should be held up as a defender of the ideas and passions of the nineteenth. We have not written his history to support any political party, nor to attack or to defend Rome. If he had proved to be a heretic or an infidel, we should undoubtedly have represented him as such; he on the contrary, has been proved to have been essentially Catholic, and in that light we have portrayed him. A system which would render history the tool of a party or of any cause, be it ever so pure and generous, has ever appeared to us false. He who undertakes to relate past events, enters upon a sacred territory, that must be inviolable; he is not called upon to step forth as the defender of liberty and of virtue, it is his duty to act under the conviction that the history of the human race is in itself a living drama, which leads man to liberty, elevating him in morals, and advancing him in civilization; whoever therefore would venture to disturb its course, however slightly, takes upon himself to correct the ways of Providence, and destroy their sublime harmony."—Pref. p. xxxiv.

Would that all histories were written in such a spirit as this; how many doubts would be solved; how many conflicting claims

would be for ever set at rest. We now proceed to remark upon some few of the more important circumstances of Savonarola's life. He was of an old Paduan family, who had settled in Ferrara, and was born on September 21st, 1452. Of his youth but few particulars are handed down to us; he possessed no childish attractions, for he was neither good-looking nor lively, but ever of a serious and quiet disposition. His father began to teach him when he was about ten years of age—it was just as the revival of letters was beginning to dawn upon Italy—the light of the Platonic philosophy had not yet fully broken out: so “the books that were put into the hands of the young Savonarola, were those of S. Thomas Aquinas, and the Arabic commentaries upon Aristotle.” It is curious to note the effect which the writings of the immortal Schoolman had upon Savonarola, so outwardly dry and syllogistic as they at first sight appear to be. “The works of S. Thomas attracted him with a degree of force almost incredible; he used to dwell upon them in a state of ecstasy, and meditate whole days upon them, so that it was with difficulty that he could be separated from them.” (P. 6.) So young! yet even then able to separate the kernel from the husk, to trace out the sublime thought that lurks beneath an exterior formal and unimpassioned.

Ferrara numbered then one hundred thousand inhabitants; while in 1452, the Emperor Frederick III. passed through the city with two thousand followers, on his way to receive the imperial crown at Rome; and in 1459, Cardinal Piccolomini, who ascended the Papal throne as Pius II., entered Ferrara under a canopy of cloth of gold, all the streets being carpeted and strewed with flowers, and the houses hung with tapestries. This was the earliest great festival that Savonarola could have witnessed. Eleven years afterwards, the Duke Borso of Ferrara died, and Hercules, the legitimate son of Nicholas III., made a triumphant entry into the city, just three months after his bastard brother had assumed the sovereignty. The adherents of Nicholas were slaughtered in the streets, and those who escaped were declared to be contumacious, and condemned to death. The old life came back again, after twenty-four hours' interruption; the feastings and revels of to-day, blotted out all remembrance of the blood which flowed yesterday. Truly it was a life in death, that old fifteenth century life in Ferrara and the other Italian cities. Savonarola took little part in these scenes. Villari writes of his earlier biographies thus:—

“They describe him to us as leading a sad and solitary life, going about dejected and disconsolate, rarely speaking, wasting in body, praying constantly with much fervour, passing many hours in the churches, and observing frequent fastings. *Heu fuge crudeles terras, fuge littus avarum*, were words that continually and almost involuntarily fell from his lips. He was then deeply immersed in the reading of the Bible and S. Thomas Aquinas, his only recreation was to play some mournful

melody on the lute, or to write verses, which were not without energy and simplicity, and by which he gave vent to the sorrows that weighed upon his heart."—P. 14.

The palaces and the prisons were alike unvisited by him; the latter were subterranean, the light being excluded from them by iron gratings.

"In them were heard the clashing of chains and the groans of the miserable beings there buried, and over their heads the sounds of music and banqueting, the ringing of silver, of brilliant Majolica and Venetian glass. Such contrasts did not fail to touch the earnest mind and sensitive heart of Savonarola; he shuddered at those sights, and during his whole life he had a melancholy recollection of the scenes he had witnessed in his youth. His mind was so often overcome with grief, that he could find no relief except in Church. Prayer was the continual solace of that excited mind, he bathed with his tears the steps of the altars where he lay prostrate many long hours, imploring comfort from God amidst the evils of a dissolute, vile, and corrupt age."—Pp. 14, 15.

Such was the earnest youth and childhood of this prophet of his age—the beginnings of those many dark shadows, which ever shrouded him in their dire embrace of suffering and of death, were even now falling upon him thick and fast—the clouds broke once, but for a short day—the heavens were bright for a little season before the lifelong gloom settled itself irrevocably upon him. We are bound to describe this evanescent light in Professor Villari's own touching and almost sublime words. God seemed to be leading Savonarola to self-sacrifice in all the events of his life.

"There lived at this time next to his father's house, a Florentine exile, bearing the illustrious name of Strozzi, who had with him a natural daughter. A citizen banished from the native country of Dante, could not fail to have a more than ordinary charm for a mind like that of Savonarola; he viewed him as oppressed by unjust enemies, as suffering for love of liberty and his native land, and by what he saw in the home of that exile, he began to conceive that there might be a people very different from that by which he was surrounded. His eyes met those of the young Florentine girl, and he then felt that first secret revelation of the heart, which creates a belief in a happiness on earth; the world shone forth to him with a new light, and with a fancy kindled by a thousand hopes, he dreamt of happy days, and full of ardour and trust, he revealed his passion to the loved fair one. But what was his grief on receiving her proud reply; in rejecting his proposal, she gave him to understand that a Strozzi would not so far demean herself as to become allied to a Savonarola! He resented the affront with words full of scorn, but his heart was left desolate. In an instant his dreams and long cherished hopes were annihilated; all happiness in life fled from him, and he was once more left alone in a multitude, every one of which shunned him. He was then twenty years of age. The recent event of the succession of Hercules made him despair of his country;

and the passion, on which he had founded all his hopes of happiness, he had found to be a cruel illusion. Where was he then to rest his laboured wearied soul? His thoughts turned spontaneously to God; the religious sentiment became powerfully dominant over his whole mind, and it created in his heart a new source of comfort, which laid open to him at length, a secure course of life; his prayers became daily more fervent, and rarely concluded without his uttering, 'O LORD, make me to know the way in which I am to guide my soul.'—P. 117.

Some two years after this, he went on a visit to Faenza, and was so much affected by the preaching of an Augustinian monk, that he resolved to devote himself to a religious life, and abandon the profession of medicine that had been appointed for him to follow. For a whole year he remained at home, with a heart almost suffocating from its agony and concealment.

"If," he says, "I had laid open my whole mind, I believe that my heart would have burst. On the 23rd of April, 1475, sitting with his lute and playing a sad melody, his mother, as if moved by a spirit of divination, turned suddenly round to him and exclaimed mournfully, 'My son, that is a sign we are soon to part.' He roused himself and continued, but with a trembling hand, to touch the strings of the lute without raising his eyes from the ground."—P. 18.

The next day, being the festival of S. George, he set out alone for Bologna, and entered the convent of S. Dominick. He was admitted to his noviciate at once, and wrote home an affectionate letter to his father. He left behind him a small treatise, "*On a Disregard of the World.*" Professor Villari thus describes his habits at Bologna:—

"In his conventual life, he usually observed a profound silence, being wholly given up to the contemplation of heavenly things. When walking in the cloisters, he appeared more like a spectre than a living man, to such a degree was he emaciated by fasts and abstinence. The most severe trials of the noviciate appeared light to him, and the superior of the convent had constantly to restrain him from doing too much. On the days he did not fast, he hardly ate enough for the support of life. His bed was of wicker work, with a sack of straw and a blanket; his cloaks were made of the coarsest material, but he was most exemplary in point of cleanliness. His modesty, his humility and submissive spirit, were without a parallel in the convent. The fervour of his prayers was such as to excite the wonder of his superiors, and his brother monks often believed him to be in a trance. It seemed as if the walls of the convent, by separating him from the world, had restored to him his peace of mind, and that he wished for nothing more than to obey and to pray."—P. 23.

For several years Savonarola remained in the convent at Bologna, in which he was soon appointed to instruct the novices; giving vent to his strong and ardent feelings upon the corrupt state of the Church in his poem, "*De Ruinâ Ecclesiæ*," from which Pro-

fessor Villari gives most copious and interesting extracts. Pius II. was succeeded by Paul II., upon whose death, Sextus IV. purchased his election. Vice in its most revolting forms was practised by every grade of ecclesiastics; the dawning of the days of Alexander VI. was come at last; things were just as bad nearer home. Giuliano de Medici was during mass assassinated by the Pazzi; Lorenzo de Medici was to be stabbed by a priest, but he escaped into the sacristy and drew his sword. In 1482, Savonarola was sent to preach at Ferrara, but he seems to have made little or no impression, and the war sweeping over the north of Italy, caused him to be settled in Florence, where he went at once to the convent of S. Mark: this convent then possessed the Niccoli Manuscripts, and was founded at an enormous expense by Cosmo de Medici. S. Antonino the founder of the "Benevolent men of S. Martin, had but lately died," and when in 1482, Savonarola entered S. Mark's convent, the memory of him was so fresh, and held in such veneration, that it seemed as if his spectre still walked in their cloisters." (P. 38.) Professor Villari pleasingly pictures Savonarola's first impressions of Florence.

"In these early days, Savonarola appears to have been quite enchanted with what he saw around him; the lovely country, the soft outline of the Tuscan hills, the increasing purity of language, and the more gentle manners of the people, the nearer he approached Florence, all seemed to predispose him to look forward to a happy life in that true flower of Italian cities, where nature and art vie with each other in all that is most beautiful. To a mind like his, deeply imbued with the religious sentiment, Florentine art acted like sacred music, and bore witness to the omnipotence of genius inspired by faith. The paintings of Angelico appeared to have brought down angels from heaven, to dwell in the cloisters of S. Mark, and he felt as if his soul had been transported to the world of the blessed. The holy traditions of S. Antonino, and the works of his love, were still preserved and revered by the friars, and whom moreover, he found so much more cultivated and refined than any he had yet known; all which contributed to inspire a hope, that at length he had come to live with brethren; his heart gave itself up to that hope; he ceased to remember the sad disappointment he had endured, and he could not foresee those that were to come when he had lived some time in Florence, and had learnt to know its inhabitants from a nearer point of view."—P. 39.

At the time at which Savonarola went to Florence, the reign of Lorenzo the magnificent, was in its zenith; masquerades and Carnivals, and the singing of the *Canti Carnascialeschi*, gay, or rather licentious ballads of the worst possible morality, and of the poorest intellectual value, had stifled all the higher aspirations of the Florentines. The highest form of art had died away, although Lorenzo was a patron of the fine arts, and Brunellesco, Ghiberti, and Donatello, flourished under him. There was a mania for

classical learning, for the form of it, without the power, and this despite the real learned men Lorenzo had united to his person, such scholars as Politian and Marsilio Ficino, who founded the *Accademia Platonica*. Both Bessarion and Gemistus, the latter a marvellous Greek scholar for any age, were rather neo-Platonists, than followers of that humbler, truer, and more elevated teaching that ever flowed from Plato himself. We regard Professor Villari's chapter on "Philosophy in Italy," to be one of the most interesting in the whole book; it enters with such hearty good will into one of the most curious, if not one of the brightest phases of the revival of letters. The state of Florence, Professor Villari describes in these words:—

"But artists, men of letters, politicians, the gentry and the common people, were alike corrupt in mind, without virtue, public or private; guided by no moral sentiments. Religion was either used as a tool for governing, or was a low hypocrisy. There was no faith in civil affairs, in religion, in morals, or in philosophy, and even scepticism did not exist with any degree of earnestness; a cold indifference to principle reigned throughout."—P. 42.

When Savonarola first began to preach to such a people as this, with his uncouth and negligent manners and language, and with his harsh pronunciation, hardly five and twenty persons cared to listen to him. Gennezzano, a favourite of Medici, was the popular preacher of the day, his discourses highly rhetorical, studded with quotations from the Latin and Greek, were made to resemble, as far as possible, the orations of Ficino in the Platonic Academy. Just as Savonarola was on the point of abandoning preaching in utter despair, his excited mind being goaded by disappointment, he saw his first vision. "The heavens seemed to open all at once, and place before his eyes the future calamities of the Church, and a voice commanded him to declare them in the face of the people." (P. 74.) Henceforth he believed his divine mission. Sextus VI. dying, he was succeeded by Innocent VIII., a monster of lust and every abomination. In the Lent of this year, Savonarola went to preach at San Geminiano, a village of the Sienese mountains; there his preaching took effect, there it was he proclaimed for the first time, the burden of his subsequent warnings. "The Church will be scourged, then regenerated, and that quickly." (P. 77.) With a calmer mind, he returned home to Florence, where he resumed his duties as a lecturer, until the next year, when he was sent on a preaching mission through the different Lombardian towns. At Brescia, he preached upon repentance, founding his warnings upon certain mystical interpretations of the Apocalypse, depicting in the strongest language the judgments that would come upon men for their sinful lives. Professor Villari writes,—“The mystical image of the elders made a deep impression on the people; the voice of the

preacher seemed to them to resound as from another world, and his threatenings struck them with terror." (P. 79.)

Father Sebastian, of Brescia, was the constant companion of Savonarola at this time, and he "told every one that Savonarola while praying, was frequently in a trance; that such was his fervour after the celebration of the mass, that he was often forced to retire into a place where he might be alone, and that sometimes the head of Savonarola appeared to him to be surrounded by light." (P. 80.) During the Lent of 1490, Savonarola preached at Genoa, and then at the request of Lorenzo, he was ordered to return to his convent at Florence, where he resumed his instruction to the novices, a few of his nearest friends begging permission to be present at his lectures, which were delivered in the cloister of S. Mark, near a damask rose tree, which from time to time the veneration of the Friars has renewed. After earnest solicitation in the August of this year, he preached in S. Mark's to a crowded church, the Apocalypse was his theme, and a mighty effect was produced by his denunciations, which were founded upon its imagery. Savonarola now published the text books of his lectures, the "*Compendio di Filosofia di Morale, di Logica,*" and "*Divisione e Dignità di tutte le Scienze.*"

We cannot follow our author in the analysis of these books, which is contained in his masterly chapter on "The Theoretical Philosophy of Savonarola." Suffice to say, that his system was compounded partly from the Platonic, partly from the Aristotelic, and partly from the mixed school which was formed at this time by Bernardino Telesio and Tommaso Campanella. Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the way in which Plato is treated by the mediæval systematizers; the salient points of his teaching are utterly misrepresented, and conclusions are put upon his words, which are altogether alien to their scope and sense. Savonarola too, took these things at second hand; as a philosopher, his speculations are more curious than useful; as a theologian, he is deserving of all respect and attention. The prevailing theological notion of Savonarola's day, was the realization of the Alexandrian conception of the *Vision of God*. The beatific vision formed the consummation of all theological virtue both for this world and the next. This desire existed in Savonarola from his birth, "it pervaded his whole life, and may rather be said to have been his life itself. His sole aspiration was towards God, he had no other hope nor desire than to sacrifice all worldly objects for that aim. In 1492 were published his four treatises *On Humility, On Prayer, On the Love of Christ, and On a Widow's Life*. His tract, "*Della orazione mentale,*" fully explains the beatific state, which it is the object of prayer to produce. God must be addressed as if present in the soul; material words are as nothing, the whole thoughts fixed upon God alone—the mind elevated above, self absorbed in

the contemplation of God. "Arrived at this state, the true believer forgets the world and its wants; he has attained almost a fore-shadow of celestial happiness." (P. 108.) Seven editions of the treatise "*On the love of Jesus Christ*" were soon called for. This love makes our souls to become "almost a part of that of CHRIST," so that "the living principle in the LORD may be reproduced in himself, not in the way of an external image, but as an inward and divine inspiration." "Man in fact rises continually from humanity to something divine, when he is animated by this love, which is the sweetest of all affections, penetrates the soul, acquires a mastery over the body, and causes the faithful to walk on earth rapt as it were in the spirit." This love yearned to be united to the LORD in suffering and in glory, of one soul with Him; "to be raised up upon the same cross, fixed to it by the same nails, and wear the same crown of thorns." Savonarola looked upon this love of CHRIST as alone capable of regenerating and imparting a fresh youth to the weary and sin-ridden world. His treatise "*On a Widow's Life*," is a purely practical manual, entering into all the details of the mode of life, dress, habits, and the like. The true source of Savonarola's power was that he "was mighty in the Scriptures." A copy of his Bible has been preserved in the Magliabechian Library, the notes and comments that he made on the margin can still be read in his own writing. Like Origen he read each passage of Scripture in three or four different senses; he recognized the *spiritual*, the *moral*, the *allegorical*, and the *anagogical*. He realized the ancient lines, and applied them throughout the sacred canon "*Litera gesta docet: quid credas allegoria: moralis quid agas: quo tendas anagogia.*" What the Bible was to Savonarola, is best learned from Professor Villari's own words.

"The Bible besides had been his faithful companion from his youth upwards, his comfort in sorrow, the instructor of his spirit; there was not a verse that he did not know by heart; not a page upon which he had not commented, from which he had not borrowed some idea in his sermons. By his studies and meditations, it had ceased to be to him a book, it had become a living and speaking world; a world without limits, in which he found the revelations of the past and of the future. He scarcely opened the sacred pages, without being exalted by the thought that he was reading the revealed Word of God; he found in them, as it were, the microcosm of the whole universe, the allegory of the history of the human race."—P. 114.

Truly by this very mystical reading of the sacred Scriptures, "Savonarola had placed himself on the edge of a precipice, over which it was difficult for him not to fall," and over which he did in fact fall. All that he wanted to find he found in the Bible, which seemed rather to stimulate than to check any of his spiritual excesses. We consider this to be a most grievous misuse of holy Scripture, despite all the false, sophistical rhetoric of the *Quarterly*

Review upon this subject (Vol. xcix. p. 3). We will illustrate Savonarola's method in a few particulars, taken from the first chapter of Genesis. *Literal*.—First day; heaven, earth, light. *Spiritual*.—Soul, body, action, intellect. *Allegorical*.—The Old Testament; Adam, Eve, the light of grace. *Allegorical*.—New Testament; Hebrew people, Gentiles, JESUS CHRIST. *Moral*.—Soul, body, in the sense of reason and instinct, light of grace. *Anagogical*.—Angels, men, visions of God. Again: *Literal*.—Fourth day; sun, moon, stars. *Spiritual*.—Metaphysics and ethics. Natural and Political sciences. *Allegorical*.—Old Testament; high priest, king, other priests. *Allegorical*.—New Testament; Pope, emperor, doctors. *Moral*.—Laws of Charity, ancient and new, other precepts. *Anagogical*.—CHRIST, the Virgin, the Ever Blessed. (Pp. 120, 121). It is a mournful, but a very truthful lesson, that we learn from Savonarola as to the right use of Holy Scripture; he was a bold, pious, personally humble minded, sincere Christian man, but these high gifts of grace did not prevent him from wresting Holy Scripture to his own and others' destruction. Every wild vision, every fanciful creation of an over excited brain, was but the fulfilment of a prophecy, or the realization of a promise to be found in the Bible. Practically, Savonarola cast away the traditional teaching of the Church, and trusted to his own excited imagination alone to guide him to the recognition of the highest mysteries of the Christian faith.

We do not say that there is no real and true allegorical and anagogical interpretation to be applied to Holy Scripture, but we do say that these things need to be applied with the utmost calmness, judgment, and deliberation, and above all, with implicit respect to the sense in which such passages were taken by the Christian fathers from the earliest times. The advocates for the over-vaunted Protestant sophism of the right of private judgment, cannot do better than study well this history of Savonarola. The great Peter Abelard erred upon a too literal interpretation of the sacred text; both men failed to combine the spirit with the letter; both men cast aside in practice the authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church. In 1491, Savonarola was chosen Prior of S. Mark, when he refused to do homage to Lorenzo, saying, "I regard my election as coming from God alone, and to Him I shall pay obedience." Lorenzo tried every means to conciliate Savonarola, coming to S. Mark's to hear mass, and remaining to converse with the friar afterwards; then sending presents of value to the convent; but all in vain, the Prior regarded him as an evil man, and shunned his counsel. Medici next employed Gennezzano, a court favourite of some popularity, to preach against Savonarola, but the tide was turned, and the Prior became more popular than before. Savonarola now was preaching his sermons on the first Epistle of S. John, sermons that Villari himself is obliged to relinquish in despair,

characterizing them as "a heterogeneous mass of ill-assorted materials, amidst which the reader becomes lost." (P. 128.) After a natural appeal to the feelings and current sins and wants of his hearers, he soon "falls back again into that artificial world of ideas, ill-connected, ill-digested, to rise again from them and again to fall back, never being able to succeed in freeing himself entirely from them, nor ever allowing them to be thoroughly dominant over him." (P. 128.) The glowing generation of preachers seemed to close with Bernardino of Siena, as the holy eloquence of the fathers of the Church had been quenched for many a century. The faith of the Church, and the expression of that faith, seemed to die out at the same time.

In the following year, 1492, Savonarola was called upon to attend the death-bed of Lorenzo, who had removed to his charming villa Careggi. At first the Prior refused to go, but upon Lorenzo's saying, "I know no honest friar but him," he went to hear the wicked man's last confession. Professor Villari thus narrates the end of the interview :

"Lorenzo had scarcely left off speaking when Savonarola added, 'Three things are required of you.' 'And what are they, father?' replied Lorenzo. Savonarola's countenance became grave, and raising the fingers of his right hand he thus began : 'First, it is necessary that you should have a full and lively faith in the mercy of God.' 'That I have most fully.' 'Secondly, it is necessary to restore that which you unjustly took away, or enjoin your sons to restore it for you.' This requirement appeared to cause him surprise and grief ; however, with an effort he gave his consent by a nod of his head. Savonarola then rose up, and while the dying prince shrank with terror in his bed, the confessor seemed to rise above himself, when saying, 'Lastly, you must restore liberty to the people of Florence.' His countenance was solemn, his voice almost terrible ; his eyes, as if to read the answer, remained fixed intensely on those of Lorenzo, who, collecting all the strength that nature had left him, turned his back on him scornfully without uttering a word. And thus Savonarola left him, without giving him absolution." —P. 142.

The contrast between Savonarola's Sermons on the Love of CHRIST, and his own conduct to a miserable dying sinner, is one which we leave our readers to develop for themselves, bidding them to remember, that when this stern fanatic mixed himself up with politics, and lost the day, it was but a just retribution that his poor body should suffer for his inflexible hard will,—that he who spoke to others so seldom the word of peace should have his own end without honour. In the Advent of the same year Savonarola had a dream which he believed was a Divine vision ; it was a drawn sword in the sky with an inscription, "*Gladius Domini super terram cito et velociter* ;" voices were heard announcing the wrath of God, "all of a sudden the sword turned towards the earth, the air

became dark, showers of swords and arrows and fire descended, and fearful thunders were heard, while the whole earth became a prey to wars, famines, and pestilences." (P. 147.) This vision is considered as the key to Savonarola's preaching; it has been engraved and represented on medals, as symbolical of himself and of his doctrine. Villari gives us another anecdote, which shows very well of what temper Savonarola was. He was preaching at Bologna, to a numerous audience.

"Among them was the wife of Bentivoglio, who was in the habit of coming very late, bringing with her a great retinue of ladies and gentlemen and pages, so that she every time disturbed his sermon. This was one of those irregularities which he would by no means tolerate. The first two or three times he stopped in his discourse, thinking that might be a sufficient reproof; but the disturbance rather became greater, upon which he made some allusions to the sin of disturbing the faithful in their religious duties. But the proud dame thus irritated came every day with greater noise and more insolent disrespect. At last Savonarola, one morning, while in all the fervour of his discourse, and experiencing the same interruption, could refrain no longer, and said with a loud voice, 'Behold, behold the devil who comes to interrupt the word of God.'"—P. 149.

The story goes on to relate that the same lady ordered two of her attendants to murder Savonarola in the pulpit; that they failed in courage to do this, so some of her satellites were sent into his cell to do him some bodily harm; however, he reached Florence again in safety. Through the kind offices of the Cardinal of Naples, S. Mark's was made an independent convent, and the Prior proceeded immediately to set about the work of reformation within it. These changes so increased the fame of the convent, that many begged to be admitted into it, and several other convents were seized with the desire of following its example. In the Advent of 1493, Savonarola is again preaching at Florence a course of sermons on the seventy-third Psalm. Faith, love, good works, and above all, the abuses of the time were the themes upon which he discoursed in his own impetuous way. His attacks upon the clergy were very coarse, quite worthy of John Knox, or of those who held the first places amongst the demagogical reformers of the violent sort.

"Charity does not consist of sheets of paper. The true books of CHRIST are the Apostles and Saints, and the true reading of them is to imitate their lives. But now, men have become the books of the devil. They speak against pride and ambition, and are sunk in both up to the very eyes; they preach chastity, and keep concubines; they command fasting, and delight to live sumptuously. Such books are pernicious, false, and wicked, and of the devil: for his whole malice is written therein. Such prelates exult in their dignity and despise all others; they are those who desire to be looked up to with reverence and awe;

they are those who occupy the high places in the synagogue, the chief pulpits in Italy; they seek to be seen and saluted in the public places, and to be called Master and Rabbi; they delight in fringes and phylacteries; they look wise and expect to be understood by gestures."—P. 170.

After the prelates, Savonarola proceeds to attack the princes of Italy, and their wicked counsellors, their new burdens and imposts, their flattering philosophers and poets. He even proceeds to rebuke the buildings of the city, it "was erected by the twelve follies of the city;" "the wicked are lost in the labour of the foolish, and the foolish will be punished." (P. 172.) Even the churches are only valued for their painting and gilding: he condemns splendid vestments and draperies, the gold and silver candlesticks, and the many chalices. The following are some of his violent words:

"There you see great prelates wearing golden mitres, set with precious stones, on their heads, and with silver crosiers standing before the altar, with copes of brocade, slowly intoning vespers and other masses with much ceremony, accompanied with an organ and singers, until ye become quite stupefied: and these men appear to you to be men of great gravity and holiness, and ye believe that they are incapable of error; and they themselves believe that all they say and do is commanded by the Gospel to be observed. Men feed upon these vanities, and rejoice in these ceremonies, and say that the Church of CHRIST was never in so flourishing a state, and that Divine worship was never so well conducted as in this day. . . . They have established amongst us the festivals of the devil; they believe not in GOD, and make a mockery of the mysteries of our religion. What doest Thou, O LORD? Why slumberest Thou? Arise, and take the Church out of the hands of the devil, out of the hands of tyrants, out of the hands of wicked prelates. . . . Hasten the punishment and the scourge, that there may be a speedy return to Thee.' He says, 'I am like hail which bruises every one who has no shelter.' He preaches on the deluge, and electrifies his audience by the terrible voice in which he cried out, 'And, behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth.'"—P. 179.

That day foreign troops were sweeping over the Alps to conquer Italy. The French were for a time successful, the Medici were expelled from Florence, and Savonarola went as an ambassador to the French camp, having previously told his countrymen that "the sword has descended, the scourges have commenced, the prophecies are being fulfilled. . . . Thy crimes, O Florence! thy crimes, O Rome! thy crimes, O Italy! are the cause of these chastisements." (P. 201.) Savonarola addresses thus the French king: "Most Christian king, if thou be not just and merciful, if thou pay not respect to the city of Florence, and if thou dost forget the work for which the LORD sends thee, He will then select another to fulfil it, and will let the hand of His wrath fall upon thee, and will punish thee with awful scourges: these things I say to thee in the name

of the LORD." (P. 219.) Savonarola now set about organizing a new government in the city of Florence, and preaching upon Haggai; both works were done in spirit.

This same temperature of mind runs throughout every event in Savonarola's life; condemnation of others is the one burden of his teaching. He saw the dark and sinful side of every question, social, political, and religious; things were doubtless very bad indeed, but they were not *all* bad as Savonarola saw them to be. The Church was corrupt indeed, yet there were hundreds of pious souls in her, men as good, nay, better than he was, who were content to hold their own without, for the sake of making a faction, denouncing their ecclesiastical superiors. Savonarola preached against the Pope, and all the spiritual powers that be, to the Florentine people, who were not the sinners; the result of such preaching being not the reformation or spiritual good of these same worldly prelates, but their political overthrow by an excited laity. Savonarola condemned the sumptuous worship of the Church which was received from the elder dispensation, and which it is predicted will be the character of the worship in the Church triumphant; he protested against the received voice of Christendom. But while he did thus, he set himself up for the LORD's prophet—the only true prophet—he required his deluded followers to believe all his monstrous visions and pretended revelations. His was a "Bible Christian,"—but then the Bible in his hands became a mere plaything—he tortured its holy words to adapt them to any sense that he chose to put upon them. Lorenzo might have been won back to goodness by careful and kind treatment, Savonarola spurned him from the mercy-seat, and left him unabsolved. Alexander VI. was a very bad man, but to Savonarola he was most lenient; the Prior would not let him be lenient; he courted persecution, persecution came, he defied it, but he sank down under it. He was a *Reformer* every whit—rough, ready, dogmatic, unbending, walking by his own light, regarding himself alone as the LORD's inspired prophet. His end might have been a peaceful one, despite his arrogance and his theological independence. But he was a politician; he expelled the Medici; he founded a new republic; he brought himself forward as the champion of a popular cause. When that cause fell, he fell with it. It was a miserable death that the poor man died; his eventful life only numbered five and forty years. He was hanged on the 23rd of May, 1498: the man who lighted the wood which was to burn the body, calling out, "At length I am able to burn him who would have burned me." (Vol. II. 360.)

On the whole Savonarola appears to more advantage under his torture and his trial than he did during the days of his prosperity. When the attack was made by the people and the government upon the Convent of S. Mark's, and the fire and smoke were

driving out the remaining monks, Savonarola assembled his brethren around the Sacrament in the hall, and addressed them for the last time.

“ ‘ My sons, in the presence of God, standing before the sacred host, and with my enemies already in the convent, I now confirm my doctrine. What I have said came to me from God, and He is my witness in heaven that what I say is true. I little thought that the whole city would so soon have turned against me ; but God’s will be done ! My last admonition to you is this,—Let your arms be faith, patience, and prayer. I leave you with anguish and pain to pass into the hands of my enemies. I know not whether they will take my life, but of this I am certain, that dead, I shall be able to do far more for you in heaven, than living I have ever had power to do on earth. Be comforted, embrace the cross, by that you will find the haven of salvation.’ ”—Vol. II. p. 300.

We learn from this that he held to the last the doctrine of the intercession of saints.

Many events intervened between the scenes we have just mentioned and his sermons on Haggai, for he both formed and kept together for a few years a new senatorial government for Florence. He complained of his four years’ labour amongst the Florentines bitterly ; he saw in them “ a whole people in a state of confusion and desolation, who had need of help, who had turned to him with a look of confidence.” “ Oh, Florence,” he exclaims, “ if I could lay open all my thoughts to you, then you would see a new and compressed vessel filled as it were with boiling must, unable to burst forth.” (P. 48.) In his political sermons Savonarola reminds one of the Puritan preachers during the great rebellion—the same perversions of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the same coarse invective pervades both preaching. This peculiarity of his preaching impressed itself even upon the works of art of the period, for in the Palazzo, Donatello’s statue of Judith slaying Holofernes, was erected as a symbol of the triumph of liberty over tyranny. (P. 287.) If S. Ignatius of Antioch has been censured by some for too eagerly desiring the crown of martyrdom, the same charge may be pressed upon Savonarola with ten-fold force. Often in his sermons, after the usual sweeping denunciations against the Church, the state, against all men, and everything around him, he turned his hearers to himself by such words as these,—

“ ‘ O LORD, LORD,’ he then exclaimed with a loud voice, that echoed through the whole church, ‘ grant to me this martyrdom, and let me quickly die for Thy sake, as Thou diedst for me. Already I see the axe sharpened.’ But the LORD says to me, ‘ Wait yet awhile until that be finished which is to come to pass, and then thou shalt show that strength of mind which will be given unto thee.’ ”—P. 300.

Of all the writings of Savonarola, his *Dialogo della Verità Profetica*, in which he converses with seven allegorical personages who represent the seven gifts of the HOLY SPIRIT, proves most clearly and painfully how completely he was deluded by his own visions, some of them being most childish and puerile. Amongst the more striking of them we would record the following:—

“In 1492, there appeared to him a black cross, planted in the very centre of Rome, and reaching to the sky, on which was inscribed, *Cruz iræ Dei*. The sky was troubled, fearful clouds were coursing through the air, the winds rushed, lightnings were mixed with darts, rain with fire and swords, and a vast multitude were dying. All of a sudden the vision changed, the sky became serene, and the black cross disappeared. Another rose from the centre of Jerusalem, which seemed to be of gold, which illuminated and spread joy over the world, and upon it was inscribed, *Cruz misericordiæ Dei*, and from all parts of the earth nations flocked to worship it.”—P. 312.

We rejoice to find that Professor Villari himself acknowledges that these “visions and prophecies of Savonarola were in great part the effect of fanaticism; sincere, no doubt, but still fanatical.” (Vol. II., p. 315.) In short, we should be disposed to define Savonarola as a politico-religious fanatic.

We most reluctantly lay down Professor Villari’s charming volumes, with a profound respect for the candour and talent which he has brought to bear upon his truly beautiful history of a very remarkable man. His book is all that the most ardent admirer of the great Florentine Prior could wish it to be; yet, after its perusal, we think that, even upon Villari’s own showing, we take but a just view of Savonarola’s work, as a Churchman and as a politician, when we regard the bold reformer as the willing dupe of his own unhallowed mental hallucinations.

MR. FORBES ON THE ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK.

Doctrinal Errors and Practical Scandals of the English Prayer Book. A Letter to the Right Rev. the Bishop of S. Andrew's.
By G. H. FORBES, Scotch Episcopal Clergyman at Burntisland.
Burntisland: Pitsligo Press; London: Hamilton and Adams.

MOST of our readers are aware of the peculiar position which the Scotch Church has placed itself in by its late General Synod, the design of which was to draw up a code of canons, and to establish the English Prayer Book as the Prayer Book of the Scotch Church. There were many reasons to induce the Synod to adopt this course; the majority, both of Bishops and Presbyters, is of English education, and in English orders; and practically the Book has been used in its integrity in most of the churches in that country; indeed it is a singular fact that for a great length of time, we believe we may say for more than one hundred years, there never has been published a complete copy of the Scotch Prayer Book, with its own peculiarities, until the publication of Bishop Torry's book, in which the usages of the Scotch Church were set forth, and the rubrics adapted, both to those usages and to the position of the Church as an independent body in a country where the established religion is wholly different from itself. This book, however, never received the sanction of the Church. Practically the difficulty was got rid of, by simply using the English Prayer Book as in England, excepting in those churches where the Scotch Communion Office is used, and then—when there was a celebration—the communicants used the form separately printed. That there is great convenience in this plan is manifest; Prayer Books from the S.P.C.K. can easily and cheaply be obtained; Englishmen travelling in Scotland had only to pack up their Prayer Book in their portmanteau, and they were ready for church. But it had also its disadvantages. Matters were much as in the Early Church. Usages were adopted by individual Bishops, which had spread with greater or less acceptability through the neighbouring dioceses. Thus there soon came to be a very marked distinction between north and south, English influences being naturally much stronger nearer the border. When the union took place between the old national, and the qualified or Hanoverian, congregations the existing usages were recognized, though not specially enumerated. The Communion Office was, however, known to be the principal thing to be conserved, and the other usages, as the cross in confirmation, and the anointing of the sick, &c., which tended to express the sacramental life of the Church, to some extent went with it. On the one side there was the English Prayer Book, which, of course, possessed in Scotland

no more authority than special canons gave to some of its offices; but which, in the eyes of the people, and of the uninquiring, enjoyed a kind of prescriptive use in Scotland, which it had derived at first from the authority of Church and State in England. People who gained most of their Church ideas from England, naturally enough regarded the use and authority of the larger Church as paramount, and could not see any reason why there should not exist, north of the border, the same certainty and settledness in their services to which churchmen south of the Tweed had become accustomed. The cry was for uniformity.

To regulate these matters, the late Synod enjoined the use of the English Book in its simple integrity, excepting in those churches where the Scotch use prevailed. Besides the reason above mentioned, there were several motives which induced the Synod to adopt this course. In the first place, it assimilated the Church entirely with her English sister—a matter of great importance in a mere worldly point of view. For there is no doubt of the fact—and the Bishops and clergy well know it—that there is daily growing in the Presbyterian mind, especially those in the establishment, a veneration for the English Church; railways, and the expansion of trade, the flood of English literature, have broken down that narrow-minded isolation which so strongly characterized the Presbyterian character of the last generation; the disruption cast out of the establishment its more bigoted and fanatical members, and, in the Highlands especially, often left so few adherents to it, that the parish Kirk is hardly able to gather a congregation on Sundays. Thus, many of the deserted ministers turn with a feeling of sympathy to the powerful and flourishing *establishment* in England. Among the laity, the better educated and more liberal, most of whom have stayed in England for longer or shorter periods, there has sprung up a liking for a ritual form of prayer, and a weariness at the monotony of a Presbyterian service. With a consciousness of this, and a further knowledge, that while the *English* Church is becoming more popular, the *Scotch* Church is still regarded with suspicion and dislike, it is not to be wondered that the Synod should think the simplest and easiest way to win over Presbyterians, and place the Church in a more popular position, was to adopt at once the English Prayer Book, lose, to a certain extent, their own personal identity, and allow themselves to be, as it were, absorbed in the great and powerful English Church.

But, admitting those advantages, there are other considerations which render it *impossible*—we use the word advisedly—impossible for the Scottish Church to adopt the English Prayer Book as it now stands, e.g., it cannot adopt the preface, for that is only applicable to the peculiarities of the Established Church of England; nor the advertisement “Concerning the Service of the Church,” for among other things occurs the following passage, “and whereas heretofore there

hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use . . . Now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use;" a statement wholly inconsistent with the permission to use the Scottish office. Again, there is the constant recurrence both in the preface and rubrics of "Parish Church." So also in the Ordination Services, the mention of the Archdeacon, an officer unknown in any Scotch diocese,¹ and the direction for the Bishop to demand the oath of allegiance, which he cannot legally do, makes it a mere impossibility to adopt the whole Prayer Book. We could mention other matters, but the above will suffice. It may be said that it would be easy to explain these matters in the Canons; but we answer: Can any one seriously maintain that an Ecclesiastical Synod is justified in adopting a ritual and book of offices for the solemn worship of Almighty God, which has to be contradicted or explained away in a Canon? Surely such a course is a miserable mockery, and a mere stultification of Synodical decision. If the Scotch Church does adopt the *offices* of the English Prayer Book, she must, at least, reprint the book with a new preface, and a new set of rubrics.

In the "Letter" before us Mr. Forbes examines only three of the Offices—the Visitation of the Sick, the Burial, and that of the Eucharist: he promises another letter, in which the other Offices will be examined. He gives his general approval of the Offices of Matins and Evensong, together with the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels: it is with the Occasional Offices, and the Eucharistic, that he finds fault.

To begin with the Burial Office; he argues that the expressions can be interpreted only in one sense, and that is, that the person buried is declared to be saved:

"Now I would first observe that we cannot possibly connect God's *mercy*, and still less His *great* mercy, with His taking away a sinner to await eternal punishment. There is no mercy about hell-fire; that belongs to His justice. . . . We cannot thank God for His *mercy* in cutting short the time of a sinner's probation, although we are bound in deep awe to admit the *justice* of all His acts.

"All I can say is, that if this be mercy, we may well ask with the Prophet, 'Where is the God of judgment?'

"Next, we are made positively to assert that God has 'taken to *Himself*' the soul of the deceased. Now what more blessed idea can we form of the privileges of heaven, than that it is to be in God's immediate Presence? Even in this life, the wicked are estranged from the Presence of God; but they will be much more so in the world to come, so that their passage from hence, instead of being taken into God's closer Presence, as the Burial Service implies, is a removal further from Him."—P. 17.

¹ Lest it should seem that we are ignorant of facts, we may mention in a note that the late Bishop Low, and the present Bishop of Argyle attempted to revive this office: both cases signally failed.

Mr. Forbes then proceeds to give a Form of his own, which, he says, he has always himself used, and which he claims the right to use, even if the English Book is adopted. Next he gives instances of the evil effects of the compulsory use of the Burial Office in the English Church, over the bodies of sinners of every description, and even over atheists and unbelievers. By the general adoption of the English Book, every Scotch Priest will be compellable by the Canon to read the Office over every baptized individual, not only of the Church, but of every heretical and schismatical body in Scotland, whose friends choose to demand it; the only exception being, of course, suicide—excommunication being practically impossible. And this done deliberately in Synod, at a time when there is a very general feeling throughout England, strongly expressed in the House of Lords, as to the necessity of some change, if not in the office, at least in the law.

We certainly do not see how this argument can be answered. The position of the two Churches is wholly different. The English Church has received her Offices as an inheritance from many generations, and, from her peculiar position, and her only lately restored synodal action, changes are very difficult to make, even though generally held to be desirable: the present generation is not answerable for them as they stand, though it may be, to a certain extent, for their retention. The case of the Scotch Church bears an entirely different aspect: she purposes deliberately to accept a state of things, admitted by all to be most unfortunate, and declared by the Primate of England to be nearly intolerable. Surely no principle of mere expediency should tolerate such an act.

Had Mr. Forbes taken this view of the question, and had he gone through the English Book and pointed out the inexpediency, nay, the impossibility, of accepting it in its present form, he might have made out such a strong case, that he would have obtained a hearing from all. Unfortunately, he adopts another course; and while he passes over many points—like those we mentioned at the beginning of this article—he falls foul of the doctrine of the English Book. This line of argument will unfortunately have the effect of not only estranging those who would have acted with him, had he taken the ground of practical impossibility, but of marring the force of his practical objections. We entirely agree with him in looking upon the attempt to give synodical sanction to the English Book, *as it now stands*, as an act of self-stultification. We deplore as much as he can do the loss of a glorious opportunity, by which the Scotch Church, by carefully reforming the Offices, and adapting them to the exigencies of modern times, and to the changes in manners and customs which have taken place since the last revision of the Book, might thus have set a proud example to the English Convocations; and, considering her position as an unestablished Church, might have adapted, and

rendered elastic, the Offices to her necessities, as a partly missionary body, thus lighting the way to our colonial and missionary Churches, for a like adaptation to their peculiar wants. All this she deliberately foregoes, and proposes to stereotype a Book, with rubrics and directions, which she cannot obey and fulfil.

This, however, is not the main point in Mr. Forbes' mind: his objections are chiefly doctrinal. Having trained his mind in the school of the non-jurors, he can only see the English Book through their coloured spectacles, and thereby shows a narrowness of mind very grievous to see in a man so truly learned as he is. We hardly think that any of the non-jurors would have used such language as Mr. Forbes does: e.g., he speaks of the English Book as being a "strange mixture of Roman and Calvinistic portions . . . engrafted upon the, in most cases, admirable groundwork of the English Prayer Book;" and he complains that "the ancient catholicity of our Church has been brought into discredit by the mediæval Romanism retained by the Church of England, or by the incongruities of Martin Bucer's additions to a system so different from his own." (P. 3.) Again: "The fact being that the English Prayer Book, as it now stands, is such a medley of contradiction, both in letter and tone, that it is quite impossible for any school to endure long which builds itself upon it." (P. 4.)

This is hardly the style of language calculated to recommend the "Letter" to the consideration of Bishops and Priests, most of whom are in English orders. But let that pass. His first objection is to the Form of Absolution in the Visitation Office:—

"The first I will mention (as indeed it is the most striking of the errors therein contained) is the pretended absolution in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick."—P. 4.

After saying that it is only necessary to quote the words in order to condemn them, he clenches the whole thus: "I need only add that it is the literal translation of the form for the same purpose used in the Church of Rome." Why not, on the same grounds, object to the "Te Deum," and the "Creed of S. Athanasius?" Mr. Forbes' two great bugbears are Rome and Geneva, and, in his horror of them, he would apparently shut up "Catholicity" to the narrow bounds of his own Church. He indeed appeals to the Greek Church, but, as we shall see presently, he comes as far short of its teaching on the Sacraments as he does of that of the Church of England. His notion of absolution is that of merely restoring to the Sacraments of the Church. After quoting some of the Scottish Catechisms, he observes, "that the very word 'absolution' is confined to the case of those who have been formally cast out of the Church, and that it is not used at all of those whose sins have either not deserved, or at least have not received, such a punishment." (P. 8.) This is, if we are not mis-

taken, exactly the doctrine of the early Puritans, as may be seen by consulting the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. For this view of the subject Mr. Forbes claims the assent of the Oriental Church; but that Church goes far beyond his teaching. She does not confound two distinct things, as Mr. Forbes does; viz., admission to the Sacraments with a Sacrament itself. Absolution in both cases is necessary, but she uses Absolution—she calls the Sacrament “Confession,” but it always includes absolution—when there has been no previous excommunication: the very fact of her receiving it as one of the Sacraments shows this. It is true that she always uses the precatory form, and not the indicative; but so she does in Baptism, for there is little or no difference in reality between “Be thou absolved,” &c., and “By His authority committed to me, I absolve thee,” &c.

We shall not go into Mr. Forbes’ objections to the Eucharistic Office: our readers know well how we have always defended and supported the Scotch Office, and how fatal a step we should think it if that Office were either disused or mutilated; but we can have no sympathy with any one who carries his love of his national Office so far as to abuse the English, and declare it heretical; and we can merely deplore that Mr. Forbes puts his own Church in such a false position as to do so. We shall only say that he denies in the most distinct terms the doctrine of the Real Presence, and holds Johnson’s theory of an impanation of the HOLY GHOST in the consecrated elements. We may call attention, in passing, that here we have another proof, if it were wanting, and one from an adversary, that the Prayer Book teaches the doctrine of the Real Presence. The whole matter contained in this part is in striking and painful contrast to his brother the Bishop of Brechin’s noble defence of the Catholic Faith of this Sacrament.

We shall conclude by saying that Mr. Forbes’ voluntary isolation seems to leave him quite ignorant of modern ritualistic writers in England, otherwise he would hardly have risked such a rash assertion as we find in page 31, that Wheatley “is the standard authority in the Church of England on matters of ritual!”

CONDITION OF SOULS IN THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I am glad to find that the article on this subject in the last published number of the *Ecclesiastic* has attracted some attention in many quarters, and on the part of the most respectable of your Church contemporaries has met with general approval. It is a further proof that the thoughts of English Churchmen are being turned just now with more than usual interest in this direction. On the other hand, I am not surprised to learn, privately, that some of the doctrinal statements in the article have been questioned, as inadequate, if not inexact. Inadequate, no doubt, they must be, on so difficult and inscrutable a subject, and therefore unsatisfactory to earnest minds which long to get to the bottom of the matter. But so far as they go, I believe, they are in accordance with Catholic theology. My own conception of the subject, such as it is, was formed some years ago in the course of a private correspondence with an eminent divine in our Church, whose theological learning on any such question would be generally respected. I had not his letters with me when I wrote the article, but I had them in mind when I drew up those statements. It was nearly ten years since I had read them; but I find now, on reperusal, that they exactly bear out the limitations to the efficacy of prayers for the dead, and the capability of deceased souls in the intermediate state, which I was anxious to define more accurately than is characteristic of ordinary Anglican teaching. The vague and defective theology which prevails on this subject is acknowledged to be unsettling and misleading. Earnest minds, unsatisfied with it, are left to speculate for themselves. Practical error, more or less serious, cannot but be the consequence. And now that a more than usual popular interest in such questions seems to have been excited, it is especially desirable that the opportunity should be taken by those amongst us of sufficient theological learning and ability to enunciate a sounder and more Catholic doctrine on the subject.

With this view, you may think well, perhaps, to publish some extracts which I append from these letters as a sequel to my article.

They will be found, I think, instructive and helpful to those, who, meditating on the mystery of God's dealing with souls in the intermediate state, are apt to make too little allowance for their entire change of spiritual condition, which can bear no reliable analogy to that of this life, when the conscious, intelligent, moral being still energizes in a body weak and subject to temptation, and is capable of deliberate choice, and so in growth of habits whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness. They may

help to correct also any erroneous suppositions as to the Roman doctrine of Purgatory; on which, in the lack of more formal dogmatic statements, there is great danger of building a groundless and delusive hope.

I am, my dear Mr. Editor,

Your faithful Brother in CHRIST,

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE ON
"THE RITES OF BURIAL."

"The statement of Purgatory you would find, I believe, to be that of the Roman writers of most authority, e.g. Suarez. I believe that any doctrine of '*progress* in sanctifying grace' after death, is heresy. I was studying Roman divines of authority last year on the subject, and what I set down was what I gathered from them, that they believed (1) that none entered Purgatory who did not leave this life in a state of grace; (2) that there was no growth in grace there: (3) that it was a state of *satispassio*, in which the souls stayed until the definite temporal debt was paid.

"Plainly, there will be a great change when this corruptible body is put off, and with it and the close of this life, the *fomes peccati* is put off, and the soul is fixed in the unchangeable unvarying love of God. Our bodies too will be changed in the Resurrection. But what I wished to guard against was that the doctrine of Purgatory held out a hope of salvation to those who would not be saved otherwise.

"Now both Roman divines and ours believe that all those, and those only, will be saved, who, when they die, are in a state of grace. Almighty God knows who they are. They must be known to Him. They are already in a state of grace in this life. In what way He will fit them for the full fruition of Himself is a distinct question. But the number of those who *are* in a state of grace now, is a certain number, certainly known to Almighty God. It is a *present fact*. It cannot depend on what is future, since what follows after this life does not change the fact in this life. The number of the saved cannot be increased by it.

"The danger of 'often falling' (if the falls are of that deep sort of which Holy Scripture says 'they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God') is lest they who so fall should at last grieve away the Spirit of God, and have not the grace to repent any more. This is the danger as relates to final salvation. There is the other danger, that they should lose that degree of bliss and the eternal love of God, which, by patient perseverance in the love of God, they might have had.

"Neither of these dangers is in the least met by the doctrine of Purgatory. If a person have sinned away the grace of God, he will not be saved on any system. The reward also in heaven, 'the crown of righteousness,' will be proportioned to the deeds

done in the body. There is no attainment (nothing which is meant by *meritura*) in the world to come. As a man sows so shall he reap.

“‘A change in the soul’ there must be of course, because the soul will no more have any inclination to sin, or be divided against itself; but no ‘progress in sanctifying grace,’ if by this is meant any increase in grace. I give you some words of Suarez: ‘*Discendum in primis est, animas purgatorii non esse in statu, in quo possint in gratia vel charitate crescere, aut in jure ad gloriam. Est conclusio certa de fide et fundamentum est, quia tempus merendi gloriam vel gratiae augmentum, in morte finitur; quod principium communi totius Ecclesiae consensu receptum est.*’ He says also, ‘*Via hominis ad merendum vel demerendum in morte finitur, et ideo in eo statu in quo tunc invenitur, immobilis permanet.*’”

“If you will look at the quotation from Suarez, you will find what I meant to state as the received Roman doctrine.

“My objection to the statement ‘progress in sanctifying grace,’ ‘growth in grace,’ is that I believe them to be delusive, suggesting that what is neglected here may be so supplied there, as to affect the measure of a person’s eternal happiness. The more any one ‘grows in grace’ here, the greater will be his eternal happiness. The reward there will be in proportion to his use of grace here. Neglect of grace here at one time may be compensated by greater diligence subsequently in this life. But the state of the soul is absolutely fixed by death, (1) whether it shall be lost or saved, (2) what shall be its final degree of bliss.

“The expression which I especially dreaded was ‘it is a special source of comfort, as *holding out a hope of salvation* to those desiring to be holy, but who are often falling.’

“I believe this to be a common delusion. For since, as I said, all those, and those only, who are in a state of grace at the time of their death will be saved, what follows after death cannot affect a person’s hope of salvation. The only question which remains is, *how* Almighty God will fit those who are saved for this everlasting enjoyment of Himself. But since all those will be saved, who, whatever their remaining stains or infirmities may be, are, at the time of their death, in a state of grace, the mode in which these stains shall be removed, cannot affect the number of the saved. This would be to limit the power of God, as though He *could* only purify through suffering of one kind.

“Salvation cannot depend upon anything after death, because a person’s final doom is fixed by that which takes place before death, ‘the deeds done in the body.’ If by his ‘often falling’ he has not sinned away grace, he will be saved; but his state of bliss, and the measure of his eternal bliss, will be fixed then. The terms ‘growth in grace,’ ‘progress in sanctifying grace,’ imply the use of that grace; and this is only in a state of probation. Roman divines

rule that in the sufferings of Purgatory, the soul is not active, but passive. They say it is *satispassio*, not *satisfactio*.

"I see that you say 'it is granted on all hands, of course, that none but those dying in a state of grace are capable of salvation.' But then the mode in which Almighty God prepares souls to receive Himself,—whether it be as it shall be in those alive at our LORD's Coming, 'in the twinkling of an eye,' or whether it be through any process longer or shorter,—makes no difference as to the question who shall be saved, or as to 'the hope of salvation,' or the amount of their bliss.

"You say that you do not see 'why the beneficial effect upon the soul through grace, from *penitential sorrow* and patient endurance of suffering for the love of God, should not remain after its separation from the body.'

"Your language implies 'agency,' 'free will.' But it is ruled as matter of faith, that *defunctorum animæ nihil agant meritoriè vel demeritoriè*. The difference, then, between what takes place in the body and out of the body is, that all change for good here enlarges the soul by grace for increase of grace, and so enlarges the capacity for future bliss.

"This is the contrast that I meant, that here is the '*tempus merendi*.' 'Penitential sorrow' belongs to this life; it is the act of a soul under trial, voluntarily humbling itself. It does not describe suffering where there is no exertion of will.

"The two erroneous impressions which I wished to remove were, as I have said, (1) that there was a better hope of being saved with the doctrine of Purgatory than without it; (2) that people might without loss put off to be done there, what should be done here. What is lost here, whether heaven or the degree of bliss there, is lost for ever. Earnest repentance here is not only a means of saving the soul, but of preparing it for a degree of bliss, which, if not attained here, can never be attained. 'Penitential sorrow' *here* enlarges the soul for future bliss: at death, the seed-time is over; the '*tempus merendi*' is closed; the degree of bliss and nearness to God for all eternity is fixed.

"Undoubtedly there must be a change in the soul, whether produced by the sight of God or in any other way, by which all the imperfections of the soul shall fall off for ever. What I meant to say was, that penitence here, obtaining increase of grace, obtained increase of bliss. *There is no increase in grace.*

"If one might so illustrate it, here the gold which is built on the foundation is enlarged—there, not; the falling away of the dross, the burning of the wood, hay, stubble, does not enlarge the gold. Here the capacity of the vessel is enlarged while it is cleansed. Cleansing there does not enlarge the capacity. Suarez meets the question, '*Cur non possint crescere?*' "

"I still think that the expression and thought of 'holding out a

hope of salvation,' is radically wrong; and that, although such persons are humble, they are mistaken. The only question as to salvation, as you yourself say, is whether a person is in a state of grace. Of course, if the Almighty God revealed that there would be suffering in the intermediate state, one should have nothing to do but to accept it. Else it is as easy to Almighty God to work all the change which these persons and all of us know to be necessary, with or without suffering. It is confessed on all hands, by Roman Catholics also, that there will be no such suffering for those who are alive at our Lord's Coming. They too 'will be changed.' The change which Almighty God will work in them; without any state of suffering, He may, if He wills, work in others also.

"The dangers in 'frequent falls' are (1) that a person may at last lose grace altogether, if they are deadly falls; (2) except for deep repentance, he would lose that grace that he would attain to by using grace faithfully. A person does lose by every such fall. I do not say that he may not recover; but if he 'often falls,' he is, during that whole time, losing ground. He is missing what Almighty God, by His grace, offers him of present attainment and future bliss.

"What I mean to say in that note is, that whatever there is in this life of repentance, faithfulness to grace, love, deeds of love, brings with it growth in grace and greater capacity of future bliss. Nothing in the intermediate state can compensate this, if lost. Both a person's salvation and the degree of bliss are fixed here. 'The patient endurance of suffering for the love of God, and penitential sorrow' in this life, do, through the operation of the grace of God, enlarge the soul (whatever its present capacity is) for a larger degree of future bliss; i.e., for a fuller participation of Almighty God. *This* is fixed in this life. To look, then, for that to be done in the intermediate state which ought to be done here, is to undergo loss. Roman Catholics say 'it is through the remissness of a soul that it goes to Purgatory at all.' But what it loses in this life it must recover. Through patient endurance and penitential sorrow, or deeds of love for the love of God here, the soul gains eternally, through the grace of God, large measures of bliss. Whatsoever is lost here is lost for eternity.

"I believe that the expression 'growth in grace' would be accounted incorrect by Roman Catholic writers, being limited to a state of probation. It implies that exercise of will and choice which belongs to the state of probation only.

"You will not think me over-critical if I say that the expression 'a course of purifying penitential processes, extending, it may be, into the intermediate state,' is incorrect, even on Roman grounds. There is no repentance, no penitential process, in the grave."

THRUPP ON THE SONG OF SONGS.

The Song of Songs : a Revised Translation with Introduction and Commentary. By JOSEPH FRANCIS THRUPP, M.A., Vicar of Barrington. Macmillan and Co., Cambridge and London.

(Continued from p. 345.)

THE solitary central verse (iv. 6,) of the third part (iii. 6—v. 1,) which comprises within itself the essence of the whole, were the phraseology of the song adopted, might properly give the title to the whole section: "myrrh and frankincense." But as this title would itself need an explanation we think that Mr. Thrupp has, with advantage, inscribed these parts, "The espousal and its results." The daughters of Jerusalem speak in the first six verses. The voice of the Beloved speaks all through the fourth chapter to the fifteenth verse inclusive. In the sixteenth verse the Bride bids the Beloved to visit her garden; and at ver. 1, the Beloved announces His arrival; concluding His address with the highly Sacramental Exhortation, "Eat, O friends! Drink, and enjoy, ye, O beloved!"

And with these words most fittingly ends the first great division of the whole work. The second part opens with a section, (v. 2—8,) which reckoning only seven verses, is the shortest canto of the poem. We may observe that the central verse of this section is also the most important; for it is that with which the whole section is connected (ver. 5).

"Up I arose to open to my Beloved,
And my hands dropped with myrrh,
And my fingers with liquid myrrh,
Upon the handles of the bolt."

The Presence is at once the longest and most intricate part of the Song of Songs. It is contained in the verses which begin v. 9 and end viii. 4. The question by the chorus, verse 9, is answered by the Bride in verses 10—16. The second inquiry of the chorus (vi. 1,) "Whither is thy Beloved gone?" is also answered by the Bride (vi. 2, 3). In the following stanzas we hear the voice of the Beloved extolling the beauty of the Bride in a strain responsive to that in which (v. 10—16) the Bride had extolled the Bridegroom:—

"But one is she, My dove, My own one,
An only one of her mother, her parent's sole darling is she:
The daughters saw her and called her blessed;
The queens, and the concubines, and praised her."

At vi. 10, the chorus breaks forth with an inquiry respecting the Bride—

“Who is she that looketh forth as the morn?”

which again corresponds to the question at vi. 1, respecting the Beloved. In ver. 11, 12, the Bride, returning no answer, tells what befell her when she went down into the garden of nuts. The chorus (ver. 13,) implore her to return; she rejoins—

“As what will ye gaze on the peace-laden?”

and they make answer—

“As it were the dance of the twofold camp.”¹

¹ Mr. Thrupp's commentary on this passage may be taken as a sample :—

“As in the previous verse the Bride had bestowed a special designation on the people who should follow her, (Ammi nadib—my people, *the freewilling*), so here a like designation is bestowed upon herself, expressive of the triumph reserved for her: ‘The Shulamith,’ ‘the Peace-laden,’ lit. ‘the be-peaced.’ The name is derived from the same root as ‘Solomon,’ and stands in partial correspondence with it. The two names differ however in import: ‘Solomon’ is simply ‘peaceful;’ and the contests of war were over ere Solomon’s reign began; ‘Shulamith,’ is ‘peace-laden,’ ‘peace-crowned,’ and expresses the triumphant return from an arduous conflict which it was needful with heroic constancy to maintain. The latter name implies therefore a period of struggle as well as a final victory; the chariots of war are the necessary prelude to the homeward return. And it is of course only through anticipation of the ultimate triumph that the Bride can be spoken of as the Peace-laden. Such an anticipation we evidently here have. And hence the occurrence of the name in this one passage only. *That we may gaze upon thee*. All naturally desire to gaze upon a conqueror, in the fulness of his triumph. *As it were the dance of the Twofold Camp*. The Hebrew term Mahanaim “two camps,” “two hosts,” recalls the scene of Jacob’s vision when returning from Mesopotamia to Canaan (Gen. xxxii. 12). Why Mahanaim, not Mahaneh? Why two hosts instead of one? Because the import of the vision was this: that Jacob’s own visible host of followers was being succoured by God’s host of ministering spirits, and so that his own natural weakness was being upheld by divine strength from on high. The two hosts were the earthly and the heavenly;² the one marching obediently along its appointed road, found itself in the succouring presence of the other. From the narrative in Genesis, the name Mahanaim is accordingly transferred into the Song, to express the invisible aid by which the company of God’s people are reinforced and upheld in the hour of conflict and of danger. The fact of its having (like Shulamith) the article prefixed shows that it is not to be taken as a mere local name, but is to be construed with reference to its etymological and historical significance. As to the dance, dancing was among the Hebrews an expression of joy, Ps. xxx. 11. And, not least, of the joy of victorious triumph. Miriam’s companions danced to celebrate the triumph of the passage of the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 20); Jephthah’s daughter would have danced to welcome back her father (Judg. xi. 34); with dances the women of Israel celebrated the return of David from his victory over Goliath (1 Sam. xviii. 6); and that of Judith from the slaughter of Holofernes and his forces (Judith xv. 12, 13). The substantial meaning then of the clause before us may be expressed in less enigmatical language as follows. We shall behold the Church of God celebrating with appropriate rejoicings the victory which, through the presence of God’s spiritual army, with her army, through divine might uplifting her natural weakness, she has been enabled to achieve. Let us here not forget the parallel passage, Psalm xxiv. 7, “The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them.” Still more closely

² But better surely with S. Jerome, “Ad fratrem iturus inimicum angelorum se comitantium excipitur chorus.” Quæst. Genes. So also Bp. Patrick. Mr. Thrupp presses, contrary to analogy, the force of the dual.

Here (vii. 1) the voice of the Beloved resumes that eulogy of the Bride which the chorus had, so to speak, interrupted at ver. 10; and he extols her charms down to ver. 6.

“How fair art thou, how delightfully lovely, O daughter of Allurements!”

In the three succeeding verses the chorus discourses to the same effects. According to some, the chorus speaks here for the last time.¹

as it appear to us, *we will regard the Church as the joyous and triumphant manifestation of all spiritual powers and resources.*

We subjoin the note of Cornelius à Lapide on the same passage. “Igitur sponsus Christus, sicut cap. 6, laudavit pulchritudinem Ecclesie ex gentibus collectæ, sic hic laudat decorem Ecclesie ex Judæis colligendæ, q.d. Quid videbis, O ecclesia gentium! in Sulamite, id est, in synagoga Judæorum jam conversa ad suum Messiam, veramque fidem, nisi chorus, præ gaudio tantæ conversionis cantantium et tripudiantium; sed chorus castrorum, quæ scilicet ita exultent, ut simul fortiter contra Antichristianos cæterosque infideles et impios decertent: *castra quippe militantium sunt*, ait S. Gregor. *Castra ergo in Sunamite videbuntur, quid pro fide, quam modo impugnât (Synagoga) tunc robuste contra infideles præliabitur.* Unde Syrus vertit: *Quid videbitis in Sunamite quæ descendit sicut cumulus vel sicut gaudium castrorum?* de perfidia velut de hoste devicto triumphantium. Arabicus: *tantum venientes chorus (alii choreas) castrorum.* Judæi enim in fine mundi agnoscetes suum Eliam, et Christum ab eo prædicatum, suam perfidiam damnantes, zelum Eliæ induent, ac Christum acerrime propugnabunt, uti fecit S. Paulus ex Judæo factus Christianus; Ita de synagoga id est Judæorum ad Christum conversione hæc exponunt Cassiodorus, S. Gregorius, Beda, Anselmus, Rupert. Honorius, Guilielmus, Cosmas Damianus, Delrio, Alphonsus ab Orozco, Alcazar, lib. 3 Allusionum ad Apocal. Nonnulli tamen ut Theodor. Justus et S. Ambr. de obitu Valent. de ecclesia in genere hæc dici putant. Audi Rupertum: *Quid aliud videbitis in Synagoga cum fides in ipsam redierit? numquid sanguinem victimarum, numquid circumcisionis cauterium? nihil omnino nisi chorus castrorum, id est, laudes seu cantiones præliantium, prælia laudantium et cantantium, quod suavissimum, quod vere est pulcherrimum: laudando chori præliantur, præliando castra laudant.*” The following, which outdoes the reveries of Crown Court, will satisfactorily prove, if further proof is needed, how nearly extremes approach each other. “Qui per quadrigas Aminadab accipiunt Turcas, per chorus castrorum accipiunt ordines militares Turcis oppositos, uti sunt Theuthonici, Hierosolymitani, Templarii S. Joannis, S. Jacobi, etc. item Carolum Martellum, Carolum Magnum, S. Ludovicum, Godofredum Bullonium, Balduinum, Carolum V., et alios qui Saracenos profigarunt. Unde notat Genebrard. in chronol. eodem ferè anno, quo Ottomanus usurpavit imperium Turcarum, Deum creasse imper. Christianorum Rodolphum Habsburgensem, a quo Austriaci descendunt, quasi eos Ottomanicis opposuisse videatur: sicut tradunt Hebræi, eo die quo Nabuchodonosor diruit templum, natum esse Cyrum qui ejus posteros delevit. Qui vero per quadrigas Aminadab accipiunt Antipapas, et eorum schismata, per chorus castrorum accipiunt veros Pontifices, Episcopos, reges et principes, qui eos Pontificia sede, quam invaserant, deturbarunt. Qui autem per quadrigas accipiunt imperatores ecclesiam divexantes, aliosque tyrannos, aut libertinos ecclesie dogmata, leges, et sanctiones profanantes, per chorus castrorum accipiunt concilia Œcumenica, et nationalia ad hæc academias apud Christianos contra eos institutas, uti sunt Paviensis, Oxoniensis, Coloniensis, Salmanticensis, Patavina, Lovaniensis, &c. Item ordines religiosos quos Deus quolibet ævo ad reformandam fidei morumque sanctitatem excitavit; aut excitatos sed senescentes renovavit et ad primævum splendorem fervoremque revocavit. Sic Deus carnalium sectæ quæ orbem occupavit ante sexcentos annos, ut plerique se darent gulæ et luxuriæ opposuit S. Romualdum et Camaldulenses, qui sua austeritate et exemplo luxum hunc castigarent. Sic Abelardo opposuit S. Bernardum, Albigenibus SS. Dominicum et Franciscum, Lutheri et Calvini S. Ignatium et Societatem Jæsu.”—Corn. à Lapid. tom. IV. p. alt. p. 645.

¹ Mr. Thrupp gives the first clause of viii. 5 to the chorus, and makes it the last utterance of the daughters of Jerusalem.

"Be thy speech as goodly wine,
Which going straight to my Beloved,
Causeth the lips of the sleeper to speak."

The section concludes with the Bride's final eulogy of her Beloved, and her adjuration repeated for the last time :

"I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,
O! that ye upstart not, and O! that ye disturb not
The play of love till it will it."

The thirty-eight verses of the section compose five subdivisions symmetrically arranged; and of these subdivisions the central piece is formed by the four verses, vi. 10—13, and is perhaps the most difficult passage of the book. Two groups of nine verses each, vi. 1—9 and vii. 1—9, enclose the central passage. Then there are the two outside groups v. 9—16, and vii. 10—viii. 4, which consist of eight verses each.

The last portion of the poem, "Love's Triumph"—the last not reckoning the Epilogue—opens with the inquiry of the Chorus. The last occasion of their speaking :

"Who is this that cometh up from the wilderness,
Leaning upon her Beloved?"

and consists of eight verses. In the latter part of ver. 5, and through ver. 6, 7, 8, the Bride speaks; in ver. 8 more particularly, bespeaking for her little sister the regards of the Bridegroom. In ver. 9, the Beloved promises to this "little sister" the fulness of divine honour, freedom, and security. In ver. 10, 11, 12, "The Bride describes the unalloyed happiness which she at last has reached." The song is terminated by an epilogue of two verses. Of these the one is uttered by the Beloved, the other by the Bride. Both speak from the point of view of the period at which the song was written; they have not yet outwardly met. Both desire the advent of the blessedness which the song has depicted. Their words are strictly of the nature of an epilogue, and form no part of the drama."

"13. *Beloved*. O thou that dwellest in the gardens,
The companions are listening for thy voice; let Me hear it.

"14. *Bride*. Haste thee, my Beloved, like a gazelle or young hart,
upon the mountain of spices."

Upon this the following is Mr. Thrupp's commentary.

"Ver. 13. *O thou that dwellest in the gardens*. The gardens more than one in number, are here substantially identical with the vineyards of i. 6, in which having been thrust out of her own vineyard, the Bride was labouring. Even in these less authorized and less welcome

scenes of labour, the lilies of true holiness might yet be found; even they therefore may be described by the pleasant names of gardens, used elsewhere, vi. 2, of the heritage of the Church of the New Covenant. The Beloved's words to the ancient Church in her abasement are thus words of encouragement,—*The Companions*. These were mentioned before only in i. 7. It will be remembered that they represented the false shepherds of Israel, of whose contumelies the Church stood in perpetual fear, while with unsatisfied longings she pursues her humble but patient labours. *Are listening for thy voice*. Among those who outwardly seemed to treat the Church but with scorn, there were many who in their better moods took a secret delight in listening to her teaching. So, doubtless is it still; and it is in the thought of this that the Church feels encouraged to persevere with diligence in even the most openly uninviting and outwardly unrequited of her labours. We lament over the discovery of the deafness of many who appear to be listening; but O! let us not forget how many may be privily listening of those who may appear to be rudely and unmovably deaf. *Let me hear it*. An invitation, not to say a bidding, from CHRIST Himself, that the Church should lift up her voice with faithful courage; whether in the accents of instruction and exhortation to all that come within reach of her utterance, or whether in those of supplication and praise mounting up directly to Him. V. 14. *Haste thee, my Beloved, like a gazelle or young hart*. The Church of Israel prays for the coming of Him, whom, though promised to her, it has not yet been her privilege to behold. *Upon the mountains of spices*. To wit, the 'mountain of myrrh,' and the 'hill of frankincense' of i. 6. The mountains of CHRIST's passion, by His visit to which His espousal to the Church was to be accomplished. The prayer is necessarily an Old Testament prayer; the song could not otherwise be an Old Testament song. But as the Church of ancient days prayed for the Advent of her Redeemer, so will the Church of these more blessed times pray not less ardently for the Advent of her final Deliverer, from Whom, after that He shall again appear, she shall no more be parted. 'Amen. Even so come, LORD JESUS.'"¹

¹ The following is from Cornelius à Lapide, on the last verse, according to the *Primus Sensus Adequatus* de Christo et Ecclesia. "Ecclesia in fine mundi conversis jam Judæis, et completo sanctorum et electorum numero, qui sedes angelorum lapsorum restorabunt, et implebunt, toto hoc opere sua ad coelum suspiria e corde sponsi amore ardenti ad eum ejaculatur, ut ibi post tot labores et agones quasi emerita et victrix cum Christo nuptias beatas consummet, eoque gloriose perfruatur in æternum, ac cum sanctis angelis jube Alleluia concinat. Unde idem suspirium hic iterat, eoque cantico concludit, imminente jam secundo Christi adventu ad judicium. Sensus ergo est, q. d. *Fuge*, id est, festina et propripe te, O Sponse, mox a peracto judicio, ex valle hac lacrymarum, tot sceleribus et ærumnis foetida et putida, in montes aromatum, id est ad colles beatæ æternitatis, ad sedes angelorum, ubi omnia fragrant thure et incenso laudum et jubilorum, eoque pariter me tecum transfer, uti solent capræ et hinnuli foetus suos secum eripere (imo sine iis nolunt se solos eripere) a venatoribus, et transferre in montes aromatis redolentes.—Unde Cosmas Damianus paraphrastice et patheticè sic explicat. O optime, et vita mea mihi charior Sponse mi Domine JESU CHRISTE; venisti tandem diu multumque vocatus mihi et expectatus. Felix faustusque sit nobis adventus tuus. Ecce jam exoptata spirat regenerationis nostræ dies; jam te exorto Summo Sole et Rege nostro principum omnium et potestatum, ceu liquescentium montium, umbræ contrahuntur; jam omnis creatura liberabitur a ser-

Let us then briefly put together in substance the arguments of the several parts as given by Mr. Thrupp.

The Church of Israel desires the very presence of her SAVIOUR, and she describes her own present state (i. 2—6), which because of its comparatively forlorn condition makes her long (7, 8) all the more for her LORD. In the midst of her loneliness and sorrows, she has a gracious vision of CHRIST's increasing love (9—11); and desiring (12—14) by spiritual communion with her promised LORD,

vitute corruptionis; jam vita nostra quæ hactenus in te condita latuit, una cum tua vita et gloria universo orbi revelabitur; jam corruptibile hoc corpus induet incorruptionem, et mortale immortalitatem, jam denique tecum de peccato et morte triumphaturi, hostibus nostris Oseum hoc carmen canentes insultabimus: Absorpta est mors in victoria. Ubi est, mors, victoria tua? ubi est, mors, peccatum stimulus tuus? Bonum certamen certavimus, cursum consummavimus, fidem servavimus, vicimus. Rogamus ergo te enixe, ut nos omnes qui sumus electi et dilecti tui, ex quatuor plagis ad te venire jubeas, et in istam nubem tuam lucidissimam rapies teque et nos e conspectu hominum impiorum quam celerrime in celum, procul e fœtidis hujus mundi montibus, ferinum leonum et pardorum vires olentibus, transferas in montes coelestes omnium gratiarum et virtutum tuarum, ac votorum nostrorum aromaticam spirantes fragrantiam. Audiat tandem, te obsecro, tua Ecclesia, promissam illam jucundissimam vocem tuam: *Tota Pulchra es—Veni de Libano sponsa mea*—item et illam—*Venite, benedicti Patris mei.*—Perro Patres hæc passim referunt ad Christi ascensum in celum—*Verum quis de Christi ascensu in celum jamdudum actum est, cap. i. in Ecclesiæ adolescentia: hinc melius hîc, ubi agitur de Ecclesia jam adulta imo perfecta, ideoque statim beanda et glorificanda in celo, fugam hanc sponsi in montes aromatam accipias de secundo Christi adventu, quo scilicet ipse in die judicii, eo peracto in valle Josaphat, ex ea cum sanctis gloriose scandet in celum, eosque secum rapiet, ut ipsos Deo Patri velut fructum crucis suæ offerat. Ita Theodoretus, Honorius, Aponius, S. Ambros. et S. Bernard. &c.*" How the Jesuit school can accommodate Scripture may be seen by the interpretation of this same verse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, under the "*Tertius Sensus Primipalis*":—"Primo Gulielmus hæc accipit de B. Virgine rogante Christum ut in celum ascendat, indeque in se et Apostolos mittat Spiritum Sanctum; *ascendat*, inquam, *super montes aromatatum*, id est, super omnem excellentiam Angelorum, qui facti sunt montes aromatatum, cum in amore Dei solidari beati meruerunt: *Propter ineffabiles*, inquit, *quibus perpetuo fruuntur delicias internæ suavitatis, ex consensu Trinitatis.* Secundo, Rupertus docet in quavis necessitate fidei confugiendum esse ad montes aromatatum, id est, invocandos esse sanctos quolibet, sed præsertim B. Virginem, quæ est Virgo virginum, mors montium, et Sancta Sanctorum: *Levavi*, ait, *oculos meos in montes unde venit auxilium mihi; sed ad te præcipue convertimur, ad te præsertim oculos nostros levamus tuum præ omnibus auxilium suspiramus. Per sanctum uteri tui sacramentum, et illum qui animam tuam pertransiit gladium, obtine ut videamus ipsam illuminationem montium æternorum, scilicet dilectum, et ex dilecto dilectum, et simul dilectionem amorum, id est, Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, Deum unum, vivum et verum, cujus regnum et imperium permanet in sæculum sæculorum. Amen.*" How far this unhappily invented application of this Divine Song is from stretching to the limits laid down by Cornelius a Lapide himself may be gathered from his own synopsis of the contents of the Song, out of which, after the first mention of her, all allusion to the Mother of our LORD is dropped. "*Sensus litteralis et æquatus Canticoꝝ est, describere conjugium Christi et Ecclesiæ per humanitatem ab eo assumptam: Partialis Christi, et animæ sanctæ, non cujuslibet, sed perfectæ; principalis Christi et B. Virginis. Primo ergo describit Ecclesiæ et animæ sanctæ infantiam,*" &c. To harmonise the commentator with himself, we should insert before *infantiam*, and in a like position in the following sentences of the synopsis, *B. Virginis*. But the modern Collyridianism of Rome makes the commentary of no effect, if it does not expose it to the charge of heresy among his co-religionists. His "*Sensus Principalis*" should have regarded the Blessed Virgin and the Human Soul; not CHRIST and the Human Soul.

she testifies how all-precious He is to her. The verses on which we now enter (ii. 1—7) instead of delineating the actual bliss of communion between the Church and her LORD, describe rather the feelings with which the former surveyed it. In the last verse she deprecates the rude assaults by which the faith of the Church is tried, or distractions and schisms whereby her singleness of aim is enfeebled, all in short which really upstirs or disturbs the love to CHRIST which she is seeking to cherish.

Thus the Church exercised her faith by anticipating her LORD's coming. But that coming was not to be immediately. There must be a previous season, and that a long season, of deferred hopes, of dark storms, of baneful attacks, and of anxious searchings. Through all these the Church must be prepared to persevere, and must learn patiently to await the Advent which in imagination she had already realized as present. Hence this section may be fully designated as the Awaiting. The storms which should precede the Bridegroom's coming are not directly described; but His coming itself is represented as occurring at the close of a comparatively dreary period.

"In the Espousal and its results," there is included a description of the litter and palanquin of king Solomon, which is also the Bride's, and in which is mystically set forth the Cross on which and by which she is united to Him and He to her. Then ensues an enumeration of the charms of the Bride's person. The first three qualities surveyed in her are her meekness, her prolific richness, and her power of rightly dividing the Word of Truth. The last three are her reverent modesty, her boldness of faith, and her power of nourishing with pure doctrine. In the middle, and therefore most prominent place, (iv. 3) stands her testimony to redemption through the Blood of CHRIST; the same testimony with that which, in the Apocalyptic vision, the Elders and Angels in heaven utter forth before the throne of God. (Rev. v. 6.) The central verse of the section, its central gem, gives the general theme of the entire. Its theme is CHRIST's surrender of Himself for the Church in a sacrificial death before that her season of grace has passed away. The verse must be regarded not as posterior in logical or chronological sequence to what has immediately preceded, but as embodying with enigmatical brevity the purport of the whole. It wraps up in itself the death of CHRIST for the Church's sake.

In the six verses (12—v. 1) of which ver. 16 is uttered by the Bride herself, the Church is compared to a garden, filled with the richest and most fragrant plants. That CHRIST may delight Himself in the garden as is meet, it must yield forth its perfumes, which it can only do through those quickening gales that by an easy symbolism represent the gracious influences of the HOLY SPIRIT. The summons of ver. 16 to these gales to blow, implies

that the time for them to blow is arrived. In other words, the Passion of CHRIST being now complete, the life-giving Spirit is poured forth from on high upon the Church, to the end that she may abundantly bring forth the fruits of righteousness to her Redeemer. And to eat those *precious fruits*, the Redeemer enters her garden; and this He does in a spiritual manner when He looks on the holy works of His Church.

With the descent of the HOLY SPIRIT, and the Redeemer's direct superintendence of His Church, the first part of the Song closes. Up to this point, in the earlier half of the poem, the career of the Church of God has been delineated. But the end was not yet. The Christian Church, now wedded to CHRIST and sanctified by His Spirit, was to pass through a new career of expectation and trial, the counterpart of the career of the Church of the older dispensation; which could be closed only by the Bridegroom's second and final appearing, just as His first Advent had been the event which closed the earlier period. The Bridegroom was to be taken away from the children of the bridechamber for a time, and they were to mourn because He was no longer present in the body with them.

This absence is the theme of the first section of the second part of the Song. But the absence was to be but outward, not internal and spiritual. Nay, this absence was itself the pledge and assurance and sign of a diviner Presence. It is indeed the time of the Church's vigilance; and if she seems to sleep her heart knows no slumber, as she sleeps by the gift of God in the restful enjoyment of the refreshing seasons of peace. During the stillness of His absence, in her night-hour, her sleepless heart heareth Him Whose Voice knocketh. In such hidden visitations does the LORD come with all the dews of the Resurrection upon Him to visit His Bride; and to bless her He again vanishes away. But there remains unwithdrawn that abiding Presence, which is the strength of the Church. Thus the fifth part of the Song, *the Presence*, stands related to the fourth. The periods of action over which the two sections extend, are contemporaneous. During this time, the LORD Himself feeds His flock, in the gardens chosen among the Gentile election; there He gathers *lilies*, all the fragrant growths of Divine Love. The *garden* is the Christian body in its unity; and the gardens represent its manifoldness. The Church's extension to the Gentile world is described under the image of the Bride descending from the fastnesses of the ancient election to look for the fruits of righteousness. (vi. 11.) Of the access of strength consequent on this adoption of the Gentiles, we have a description in a passage already quoted. Having stated one by one the various blessings of CHRIST's final appearing, the Bride declares, viii. 2, "I would cause Thee to drink of spiced wine." All the various products of the Bride's garden represented the

various acts and affections of devotion of the Church to her LORD. Wine, in particular, symbolizes the joint participation of both host and guest in the joys of a feast, and therefore their mutual communion with each other.

What the Church here offers to CHRIST she has all along been drinking herself. As to the wine being spiced, it will import, if we recall the symbolical significance of myrrh as the principal ingredient, that the death of CHRIST lies at the root of all the communion of the Church with Him. And this is, in fact, exactly what is outwardly represented to us in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. It is of a wine which may be figuratively described as spiced with death, a wine associated with the memory of all our LORD's mortal sufferings, that we there partake; and by it we show forth the LORD's death until He come. All the genuine devotion which our several sacramental acts have represented He will then enable us to present to Him in its most perfect form, Himself then drinking of the fruit of the vine new with us in His FATHER's kingdom.

Thus disciplined, is the Bride prepared for the Triumph of Love. "Under the citron tree," she says, "I raised Thee up." By all the ministries of the Spirit, Israel had been the means of raising up the long looked for MESSIAS; and when He came, He was brought up under the ordinances and in the discipline of the Church of Israel. It was the Bride, the Church, which raised Him up; it was the Mother, the nation, that brought him forth. And the Bride dwells upon this now, when she is united with Him to be parted no more, in order to show how intimately connected with her He was, and how it was as one thus intimately connected with her that He was now finally manifested to her. In other words, He is come for the second time, even as He came at the first in the flesh; the glorified, but still the very Son of Man. He appears to the Bride according to her prayer, as her Brother, as one who has sucked the breasts of her mother. He is to her both Brother and Bridegroom: as such He had previously declared Himself (iv. 9), and as such she now, at His re-appearing, welcomes Him; and He now has re-appeared in the power of that Divine Love which overmasters death and hell.

In conclusion the Bride adverts for a moment to her younger sister, the Gentile Election. She consults the Bridegroom, and He replies, still using the plural number, to show the perfect identification of interest that exists between the Bride and Bridegroom, "We will build up our Gentile sister in full proportions, and with all that is needful for her; and every part of her framework shall be of the costliest. As for her wall of enclosure, we will fence her around with silver; as for her doors, of cedar alone, and of no inferior wood, shall they be constructed." Thus, tender and unfurnished though she now appear, she shall not in her bridal day be

found wanting, but shall, through Divine grace, display in all richness the glories that are meet for the Spouse of CHRIST."

The vineyard in Baalhamon represents the fully organized Church in the midst of the tumultuous world. The Church thus placed has been let out to keepers; that is, the various officers and ministers in the Church, and secondly, all the members of the Church, so far as any responsibility, in respect of themselves or their brethren, rests upon them. The LORD desires fruit that will abound to their account, and He will demand this return. With these solemn words the dramatic part of the poem ends.

II. We have devoted so much space to laying before our readers the argument of the poem as drawn out by Mr. Thrupp, that we have little room left to dwell upon the "use" of this most precious portion of God's Word. It must ever remain a subject of profound regret that no chapter of the Song of Songs is read in our Services. And the regret is not diminished when we compare the studied exclusion of this Book, as well as of the Apocalypse, with the introduction of some of the Books and Chapters that are appointed from the Old Testament. Surely it would be more reverent, and surely it would be more wise, to read, instead of many of the historical portions, some of the more mysterious chapters of Ezekiel, and the first, second, third, seventh, and eighth chapters of the Song of Songs. What more useful lesson for a Christian congregation, than to be convicted of its own ignorance, while listening to these awful and as yet unfathomable mysteries of God? And surely the same method of selection might be employed at Evening Service with regard to the Apocalypse, whose subject-matter and structure might well justify its introduction as a first lesson. But, in fact, every Clergyman has the means in his power of rectifying this grave mistake, and releasing the Church from the apparently well-merited imputation of dealing subtly with the Word of God. By often preaching from these portions of the Word of God, by frequent and lengthy quotations from them in sermons, a congregation can readily be made to remember their sanctity, mystery, and authority. As it is, the Clergy are as insensible as the Church Calendar to the existence of such a Book as the Song of Songs. Much of the coldness, much of the spiritual insensibility of our people, may arise from their being denied all communion with the glowing affections of this Divine work, which, if we might presume to describe briefly, we think might well be regarded as furnishing *the standard of religious emotion*, and the *language into which the Divine affections should translate themselves*; such emotions and affections rooting themselves in, and indeed springing from, the Church. The unbecoming—the not seldom fearful—familiarities into which the thought and tongue of man is prone to run, make such a standard greatly needed. And no less do we need to be reminded of the inflamed and earnest

affections with which our hearts should wait on the LORD JESUS. We need to be reminded every day more and more that a right faith in its widest extension takes in a right feeling; that *orthopathy*—if we may coin the word—is as essential as orthodoxy; forms, in a word, the *inner*, as this does the *outward* lining of the shield of faith. This *personal* love of the LORD JESUS, which the Song of Songs so pre-eminently holds forward, we can fail to feel and to reflect only through ignorance, or sin, or both. It would seem indeed that, under the risen JESUS, the despondent utterances of the Psalms no longer suited the children of the ALMIGHTY; that as the Easter joy of the whole Christian heart should know no abatement,—as we should rejoice in the rising of our LORD as freshly and as freely as though this very day that Divine event was consummated,—so should our joy in CHRIST, wheresoever else, howsoever else we may be in affliction, be the faithful transcript of the passionate devotion of the heavenly Bride for her Divine Bridegroom.

And for this very reason,—our low standard of Christian knowledge, and Christian obedience, and Christian love,—we must remain content to expound, in the class and closet rather than in the congregation, this Eucharistic Song. Fit audience thus S. Bernard found in the refectory. We know not what numbers—we are fully sensible of the distance we traverse at a word—in S. Dunstan's in the West, London, attended the twelve sermons of the lecturer, the excellent W. Romaine.¹ Gill tells us, in his preface to his Exposition of the Song of Songs in one hundred and twenty-two sermons, that he published at the "importunity" of his congregation, what he wrote for their "use, profit, and edification." Perhaps the Conventicle may still be patient of such severe homilies; the Church certainly is not. For the comparatively private Bible class and lecture, and for *private prayer*, the Song of Songs is best adapted—as *the Church is now*; and, bating his one neological speculation, we very cordially and earnestly commend Mr. Thrupp's work, in the hope it will lead the way to a more general and devout appreciation of the "Song of Songs which is Solomon's."

¹ To these pious discourses the author prefixes a preface, in which he says (2nd Edit. 1790):—"It is a certain but a melancholy matter of fact, that there has been more ridicule wasted upon the Song than upon any other portion of God's Word. And we need not marvel at it. The devil has a particular spite against this book; he hates the subject, and he hates the composition. He cannot bear to hear of man's being restored to that fellowship and communion with God which himself once had, but can never hope for again." Adam Clarke warns his preachers against the use of the Book in the pulpit.

ALEXANDER SMITH'S ESSAYS.

Dreamthorp. A book of Essays written in the Country. By ALEXANDER SMITH, Author of "A Life Drama," &c. Strahan and Co.

THESE Essays are eccentric and attractive—they are written with freedom and feeling. Unbridled imagination might perhaps be said to over-ride consistency occasionally, and in a less generous mind such a habit of thought might be dangerous. Mr. Smith's natural sympathies and instincts are true, and his Essays are, we should say, a good portrait of himself. In the midst of so much to please, it is not agreeable to find faults, but we would suggest that his sympathies with nature as he finds her, lead him into inconsistencies of expression, of which he does not seem aware. For example, in his chapter on "Vagabonds,"—by which term he means, a man who is independent of all conventional customs, whose imagination is wild, generous and free, whose mind is "as full of queer nooks and tortuous passages as any mansion house of Elizabeth's day or earlier, where the rooms are cosy, albeit a little low in the roof"—he says in speaking of Jacob and Esau, after enumerating the blessings of the former, whom he states to be "no favourite of his:"

"In spite of all these things, I would rather have been the hunter Esau, with birthright filched away, bankrupt in the promise, rich only in fleet foot and keen spear; for he carried into the wilds with him an essentially noble nature—no brother with his mess of pottage could mulct him of that. And he had a fine revenge; for, when Jacob, on his journey, heard that his brother was near with four hundred men, and made division of his flocks and herds, his man-servants and maid-servants, impetuous as a swollen hill-torrent, the fierce son of the desert, baked red with Syrian light, leaped down upon him, and fell on his neck and wept. And Esau said, 'What meanest thou by all this drove which I met?' and Jacob said, 'These are to find grace in the sight of my lord;' then Esau said, 'I have enough, my brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself.' O mighty prince, didst thou remember thy mother's guile, the skins upon thy hands and neck, and the lie put upon the patriarch, as, blind with years, he sat up in his bed snuffing the savoury meat? An ugly memory, I should fancy!"—Pp. 280, 281.

We can understand that a man's natural sympathies may readily linger with Esau in his bitter and fruitless search after repentance, but this is a subject on which Faith stamps a significance above the range of our natural feelings, and reverence due to the wisdom and majesty of inspiration, will not allow such subjects to be measured by mere human sympathies.

The 'vagabond' described by Mr. Smith is very well as an idea, and as an exception, may be a very interesting individual; but a world of such vagabonds, would be a most restless and ill regulated world, and we think that though generous eccentricity, if natural, has in it something attractive, it is not well to foster the notion; and while we may with our author, respect "harmless eccentricity," we would deprecate the notion that "every man should be allowed to grow in his own way." We think that the result would be even more painful than the "drill of Adjutant Fashion." The following extract will give the description of Mr. Smith's vagabond.

"There is an amiability about the genuine vagabond which takes captive the heart. We do not love a man for his respectability, his prudence and foresight in business, his capacity of living within his income, or his balance at his banker's. We all admit that prudence is an admirable virtue, and occasionally lament, about Christmas, when bills fall in, that we do not inherit it in a greater degree. But we speak about it in quite a cool way. It does not touch us with enthusiasm. If a calculating-machine had a hand to wring, it would find few to wring it warmly. The things that really move liking in human beings are the gnarled nodosities of character, vagrant humours, freaks of generosity, some little unextinguishable spark of the aboriginal savage, some little sweet savour of the Adam."—Pp. 277, 278.

We have enlarged rather on this chapter here, though it stands last in the book, because the vagabond spirit runs through the whole; yet we cannot but admire the Essays, as the production of a generous and large hearted man.

Mr. Smith has a happy way of viewing the most commonplace things and circumstances, and can surround the very stones with interest. In everything he sees "an Essay in bud." The carrier's cart, the pauper's coffin, a child asleep in the sunshine, in fact every trivial circumstance is suggestive.

The volume contains twelve Essays; the first, a description of Dreamthorp, is fanciful and pretty. The village is one on which "centuries have fallen, and have left no more trace than last winter's snowflakes," and in the author's happy imagination, it is beautiful and a special favourite of summer's. "Summer, with its daisies, runs up to every cottage door, and every window-sill in it she touches with colour and fragrance." There he says, he can live as he pleases, there he "can throw the reins on the neck of his whim." There he can "play with his thoughts," and there he can "ripen for the grave." There too, "with the former inhabitants of the place," he says, "I trust to sleep quietly enough, and nature will draw over our heads, her coverlet of green sod, and tenderly tuck us in, as a mother her sleeping ones, so that no sound from the world shall ever reach us, and no sorrow trouble us any more."

The second, on the writing of Essays, is clever: we will only note

the author's comparison between Bacon and Montaigne. Of Bacon he says,

"He lives amongst great ideas, as with great nobles, with whom he dare not be too familiar. In the tone of his mind there is ever something imperial. When he writes on building, he speaks of a palace with spacious entrances, and courts, and banqueting-halls; when he writes on gardens, he speaks of alleys and mounts, waste places and fountains, of a garden 'which is indeed prince-like.' To read over his table of contents, is like reading over a roll of peers' names. We have, taking them as they stand, essays treating *Of Great Place, Of Boldness, Of Goodness, and Goodness of Nature, Of Nobility, Of Seditions and Troubles, Of Atheism, Of Superstition, Of Travel, Of Empire, Of Counsel*,—a book plainly to lie in the closets of statesmen and princes, and designed to nurture the noblest natures. Bacon always seems to write with his ermine on."—Pp. 32, 33.

Montaigne was different from all this. He was as wise as Bacon, but in comparison, "his table of contents reads like a medley, or a catalogue of an auction."

"Bacon is the greatest of the serious and stately essayists,—Montaigne the greatest of the garrulous and communicative. The one gives you his thoughts on Death, Travel, Government, and the like, and lets you make the best of them; the other gives you his on the same subjects, but he wraps them up in personal gossip and reminiscence. With the last it is never Death or Travel alone; it is always Death one-fourth, and Montaigne three-fourths; or Travel one-fourth, and Montaigne three-fourths. He pours his thought into the water of gossip, and gives you to drink. He gilds his pill always, and he always gilds it with himself. The general characteristics of his *Essays* have been indicated, and it is worth while inquiring what they teach, what positive good they have done, and why for three centuries they have charmed, and still continue to charm."—P. 39.

Whatever Montaigne says suggests the opposite. In his grave moods, he is eloquent, intricate, and highly wrought; and he alternates his stateliness with familiarity, anecdote, humour, and coarseness.

"It is in Montaigne's style, in the strange freaks and turnings of his thought, his constant surprises, his curious alternations of humour and melancholy, his careless, familiar form of address, and the grace with which everything is done, that his charm lies, and which makes the hundredth perusal of him as pleasant as the first."—P. 44.

"Death and dying," viewed by Mr. Smith in the abstract, apart from all considerations but one, viz., its certainty, is peculiar, and contains useful ideas. Death invests alike the king and peasant with grandeur; the solemn stillness which gathers on the dead man's face surrounds him with dignity that none can intrude upon;

and in this certainty lies the secret of much human happiness. For, says Mr. Smith,

"The thoughtful happiness of a human being is complex, and in certain moved moments, which, after they have gone, we can recognise to have been our happiest, some subtle thought of death has been curiously intermixed. And this subtle intermixture it is which gives the happy moment its character—which makes the difference between the gladness of a child, resident in mere animal health and impulse, and too volatile to be remembered, and the serious joy of a man, which looks before and after, and takes in both this world and the next. Speaking broadly, it may be said that it is from some obscure recognition of the fact of death that life draws its final sweetness. An obscure, haunting recognition, of course; for if more than that, if the thought becomes palpable, defined, and present, it swallows up everything. The howling of the winter wind outside increases the warm satisfaction of a man in bed; but this satisfaction is succeeded by quite another feeling when the wind grows into a tempest, and threatens to blow the house down. And this remote recognition of death may exist almost constantly in a man's mind, and give to his life keener zest and relish."—*P. 56.*

We will make brief comment upon two other of these essays, "A Lark's Flight," and "Christmas." The former is on capital punishment, though the subject does not agree with the title, which arose from a touching occurrence that marked the moment of the execution of two murderers. The Essayist does not enter into the subject of the right or wrong of capital punishment, but in powerful language states his opinion as an individual observer.

"To my own thinking, it is out of this pain and hatefulness that an execution becomes invested with an ideal grandeur. It is sheer horror to all concerned—sheriffs, halbertmen, chaplains, spectators, Jack Ketch, and culprit; but out of all this, and towering behind the vulgar and hideous accessories of the scaffold, gleams the majesty of implacable law. When every other fine morning a dozen cut-purses were hanged at Tyburn, and when such sights did not run very strongly against the popular current, the spectacle *was* vulgar, and could be of use only to the possible cut-purses congregated around the foot of the scaffold. Now, when the law has become so far merciful; when the punishment of death is reserved for the murderer; when he can be condemned only on the clearest evidence; when, as the days draw slowly on to doom, the frightful event impending over one stricken wretch throws its shadow over the heart of every man, woman, and child in the great city; and when the official persons whose duty it is to see the letter of the law carried out perform that duty at the expense of personal pain,—a public execution is not vulgar, it becomes positively sublime. It is dreadful, of course; but its dreadfulness melts into pure awfulness. The attention is taken off the criminal, and is lost in a sense of the grandeur of justice; and the spectator who beholds an execution, solely as it appears to the eye, without recognition of the idea which

towers behind it, must be a very unspiritual and unimaginative spectator indeed."—Pp. 94, 95.

The incident which suggested the title of this essay must be given in the author's own words:—

"And now it was," (as the two criminals stood before the crowd assembled to witness their execution,) "that the incident so simple, so natural, so much in the ordinary course of things, and yet so frightful in its tragic suggestions, took place. Be it remembered that the season was early May, that the day was fine, that the wheat-fields were clothing themselves in the green of the young crop, and that around the scaffold, standing on a sunny mound, a wide space was kept clear. When the men appeared beneath the beam, each under his proper halter, there was a dead silence,—every one was gazing too intently to whisper to his neighbour even. Just then, out of the grassy space at the foot of the scaffold, in the dead silence audible to all, a lark rose from the side of its nest, and went singing upward in its happy flight. O heaven! how did that song translate itself into dying ears! Did it bring in one wild burning moment father, and mother, and poor Irish cabin, and prayers said at bed-time, and the smell of turf fires, and innocent sweethearting, and rising and setting suns? Did it—but the dragoon's horse has become restive, and his brass helmet bobs up and down and blots everything; and there is a sharp sound, and I feel the great crowd heave and swing, and hear it torn by a sharp shiver of pity, and the men whom I saw so near but a moment ago are at immeasurable distance, and have solved the great enigma,—and the lark has not yet finished his flight; you can see and hear him yonder in the fringe of a white May cloud."—Pp. 108, 109.

The Essay on "Christmas," is expressive of the charity and good feeling of our author, who, though alone, yet enters warmly in imagination into the domestic joys of so many homes, being happy in the thought that so many others are; and joining in all the pleasures of the season, though seated at his solitary table, rejoicing in the Great Event, which put to flight the followers of Pagan mythology; remembering with affection that the poor are especially commended to Christian care at this eventful time, and thankfully delighting in the power of the Cross to subdue, and proclaiming its power to triumph by giving the prophetic testimony of one who could not be even called a Christian poet, viz., Shelley, before whose dying eyes the Cross was gathering attractions.

We will conclude with the following triumphant poem by Shelley, and one more extract from the essay:—

"A power from the unknown God,
A Promethean conqueror came:
Like a triumphal path he trod
The thorns of death and shame.
A mortal shape to him
Was like the vapour dim
Which the orient planet animates with light.

Hell, sin, and slavery came
 Like bloodhounds mild and tame,
 Nor prey'd until their lord had taken flight.
 The moon of Mahomet
 Arose, and it shall set;
 While blazon'd, as on heaven's immortal noon,
 The Cross leads generations on.

* Swift as the radiant shapes of sleep,
 From one whose dreams are paradise,
 Fly, when the fond wretch wakes to weep,
 And day peers forth with her blank eyes:
 So fleet, so faint, so fair,
 The powers of earth and air
 Fled from the folding star of Bethlehem.
 Apollo, Pan, and Love,
 And even Olympian Jove,
 Grew weak, for killing Truth had glared on them.
 Our hills, and seas, and streams,
 Dispeopled of their dreams,
 Their waters turn'd to blood, their dew to tears,
 Wail'd for the golden years.'

"For my own part, I cannot read these lines without emotion—not so much for their beauty as for the change in the writer's mind which they suggest. The self-sacrifice which lies at the centre of Christianity should have touched this man more deeply than almost any other. That it was beginning to touch and mould him, I verily believe. He died and made *that* sign. Of what music did that storm in Spezia Bay rob the world!"—Pp. 129, 130.

These essays have all the appearance of having been written for some of the many periodicals which carefully eschew doctrine, or, at least, Church doctrine. We are disappointed, nevertheless, to find such a total absence of anything indicative of the author's *ἦθος*. We should have hoped better things of the author of "Edwin of Deira."

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Man considered in respect of Freedom, Dependence, and a State of Probation. By Mr. W. ENGLISH, M.A., Curate of Abbot's Langley, Herts. Rivingtons.

THIS essay is written with the view of discussing some avowedly difficult points of Christian doctrine, the nature of which will be seen by the title. The author's arguments are clear, concise, and powerful. The essay is divided into two parts, the first of which contains three chapters. Chap. I., "On Human Freedom," treats of man as a free agent, responsible for his actions, of the infinite GOD, and the finite man, as separate and distinct, though co-existing in effect, that GOD is not man, and man is not a part of GOD, but a distinct and yet dependent personality, possessing a separate will, and thus constituting a

self-determining being; for the power that invests man with responsibility, Mr. English argues, must be his own, as no person could be responsible for the exercise of a power that he did not possess: yet as GOD is distinct, free, and independent, or He would not be supreme, so man must be distinct, free, and independent, or he would not be responsible. The difference in the freedom of GOD and man being that the intelligence of one is finite, and dependent on time and space, the other is infinite and independent of all such conditions.

In Chap. II. Mr. English proceeds to reconcile the dependence of man and the sovereignty of GOD, with the distinct freedom of the human will. We will give the conclusion in the author's own words.

"The sovereign ways of GOD and the free agency of man meanwhile may be illustrated by one actual case. The death of our Blessed LORD may help to show how the divine and the human spheres of action interpenetrate, leaving at the same time freedom to man. The Divine will may be viewed as the *efficient* cause, the world's salvation the *final* cause, and the Jews the *instrumental* cause in the SAVIOUR's expiatory death. Were the Jews free agents in performing the part they did? if they were, then surely this ought to settle the question of human freedom. And I think I may affirm that it were little short of blasphemy to say that the Jews were at all constrained by the sovereign purposes of GOD in this mighty predetermined event. As was said of our first parents, so we may say of the Jews,

'Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault
Which had no less proved certain, unforeseen.'

"Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of GOD, ye have taken, and by *wicked* hands have crucified and slain." By *wicked* hands, then the deed was sinful! albeit made to work out GOD's sovereign purposes. But how could this be if man were not free in the sphere of action assigned to him? Could the law of GOD be the expression of the will of GOD, this act of the Jews contrary to both that law and that will, and yet be constrained in any sense by GOD? This would certainly make GOD the author of confusion, and at once the law maker and the law breaker." —Pp. 19, 20.

Chap. III. is "On a State of Probation." Mr. English says there either is or is not such a thing. If there is not, why argue about free will? if there is, it must be equally useless to dispute it. The day of grace spoken of means nothing if freedom is withdrawn, and judgment, which implies previous opportunities, would be useless if man were not free. Thus GOD in His own eternity beheld the future as the present, and in "purposing" the two seasons, temporal and eternal, and the two conditions of man, did also mark out two separate and distinct principles of government, viz., probation and freedom, and the fixed eternal condition in the next world, implying the withdrawal of that freedom.

The second part of the essay is a carrying out of the first by an exposition of passages of Scripture contained in the Epistle to the Romans, chapters 8—11. In order to give the author's views on the subject of the "Divine Purpose" concerning salvation we cannot do better than make two quotations, one showing Dean Alford's and Canon Wordsworth's separate views, which he controverts, and the other an extract from Hooker, which he adopts.

"Both Dean Alford and Canon Wordsworth appear to have confounded Predestination with Purpose. From opposite standing points they have made

two terms co-extensive in meaning, Dean Alford making them to embrace only such as will finally be saved, Canon Wordsworth making them to embrace all men."—P. 32.

In conclusion the following extract from Hooker affords the exact distinction between the "Divine purpose as God's primary intention to save *all*, and predestination as God's consequential act of saving only those who *persevere*."

"That in God," says Hooker, "there were two wills, an antecedent and a consequent will. His first will, that all mankind should be saved, but His second will was that those only should be saved that did live answerable to that degree of grace which He had offered or afforded them."—P. 28.

Lyra Eucharistica : Hymns and Verses on the Holy Communion, Ancient and Modern, with other Poems. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London : Longmans.

THIS volume is a real gain to English literature. But few libraries perhaps contain the translations of Dr. Neale and Mr. J. D. Chambers, of Deans Trench and Alford, of Dr. Faber and Miss Winkworth, of Mr. Caswall and Mr. Isaac Williams. But besides collecting together these and others, which are less known, Mr. Shipley has been able, by the help of friends, to add both original Hymns and new translations to a very considerable number. Here then we have a volume, which will supply food to the devout mind, in connection with the great act of Christian Worship, such as certainly did not exist before ; and to many minds we apprehend, there will be found to be more of edification in these Hymns, than in treatises of a directly doctrinal or didactic nature.

We give one specimen, just to show that the new element in the volume is of really solid value ; it is called a Processional Hymn.

"In the Name of God the FATHER,
In the Name of God the SON,
In the Name of God the SPIRIT
One in Three, and Three in One,
In the Name Which highest Angels
Speak not ere they veil their face,
Crying—Holy, Holy, Holy,
Come we to this sacred Place.

"Lo in wondrous Condescension,
Jesus seeks His Altar-throne ;
Though in lively symbols hidden,
Faith and Love His Presence own :
When the Lord His Temple visits,
Let the list'ning earth be still ;
May the Spirit's sweet indwelling
Each believing heart fulfil.

"Here in Figure represented,
See the Passion once again ;
Here, behold, the Lamb most Holy,
As for our Redemption slain ;
Here the SAVIOUR'S Body broken,
Here the Blood Which JESUS shed—
Mystic food of Life Eternal—
See, for our Refreshment spread.

"Here shall highest praise be offered,
 Here shall meekest prayer be poured,
 Here with Body, Soul, and Spirit,
 God incarnate be adored :
 Holy JESU, for Thy coming,
 May Thy Love our hearts prepare ;
 Thine we fain would have theth wholly,
 Enter, LORD, and tarry there."—Pp. 18, 19.

A reprint of *Edward VI.'s First Liturgy*, (Masters,) will generally, we apprehend, be considered a seasonable publication, when so many minds are engaged in searching into the great mystery of the Eucharist.

DR. MONSELL's and Mr. W. J. STRACEY's Papers on *English Sisterhoods*, (Masters, and Bell and Daldy,) suffice to show that the interest felt in Sisterhoods, is not flagging. They are both modest and well intended Essays, designed perhaps as much to clear the authors' own views, as to impart information to others,—tentative rather than conclusive.

MR. RIDLEY's name is a guarantee for earnest and moderate doctrine, and this character he still continues to sustain in his *Sermons in Plain Language*, (Moxleys). We regret to see that he repeats the mystifying view of the double meaning in Confirmation.

Some five or six years ago, Mr. MALAN published some "Prayers and Thanksgivings for the Holy Communion, chiefly for the use of the Clergy, translated from Coptic, Armenian, and other Eastern Rituals." Now we have from him a companion volume, derived from similar sources, *Chiefly for the use of the Laity*. We welcome anything which brings English Churchmen better acquainted with other branches of the Mystical Vine.

We gladly welcome a new musical Penny Periodical, published weekly, (London, Theodore Wright,) called *The Choir and Musical Record*. Each number contains four pages of standard music, and as we judge by the names connected with the undertaking, Gregorian music will be fairly dealt with.

Eustace, or the Lost Inheritance, by the Rev. EDWARD MONRO, (London, Masters) is a singularly beautiful tale, illustrative of some of the deepest principles and subtlest difficulties of the inner life. The language, as might have been expected from the well known author, is exquisitely touching, full of delicate allusions, which display a deep knowledge of the human heart, and treating at once with tenderness and judgment, the failures and struggles of a soul faltering on the painful way of eternal life. Some might be disposed to think the principal character, Eustace, quite unnatural, because fervent, self-denying religion, is indeed so rare amongst school-boys. Yet we have known such in real life, and assuredly those true and spiritually minded Priests, who as men exercise such wonderful influence over others by the power of their stern self-devotion, must have trained themselves early by personal holiness, for the warfare of the Cross. The leading idea of the book, that of an earthly inheritance lost by the very effort to attain a heavenly, and in the opposite case, the worldly treasure becoming valueless for lack of the true riches, is admirably worked out, and the whole tale is one of unusual merit.

OBITUARY NOTICE.

WE cannot allow this number of the *Ecclesiastic* to go forth without containing a tribute of affectionate respect to the memory of its late Publisher and Proprietor. The Church is more nearly interested in the character of her Publishers than many perhaps would admit; and an intimate acquaintance of eighteen years' duration enables us to testify that a more upright and kind-hearted man than JOSEPH MASTERS could not be found.

Mr. Masters commenced business as a Printer in London in the year 1827, having served his apprenticeship at a time when that relationship was much more close than at the present day, to Mr. Lomax, of Lichfield, of which place he was a native. The business in which he was first engaged, and which had all the characteristics of safeness and respectability, was of a general kind; but becoming interested, like many others, in the Church revival, which was then but new, he gradually gave up the general business of a Printer, and devoted himself with great energy to the publication of Church works.

The undertaking which first brought him into public notice, was the Series of Sermons by various authors, which appeared in the year 1845, under the Editorship of the Rev. A. Watson; and this was followed at the commencement of 1846 by the publication of the *Ecclesiastic*. When Mr. Burns left the ranks of the Church Mr. Masters purchased his most valuable copyrights, and became at once the most decided Church Publisher of the day.

Mr. Masters did not lay claim to that instinctive critical sagacity which has raised the fortunes of some Publishers. It would have been well for his business, perhaps, if he had exercised a more stringent severity in its prosecution; but his business, in fact, became his hobby, and while his general desire was to serve the Church, the independent position from which he started enabled him all along to indulge his own personal feelings, to an extent by no means usual with persons engaged in trade. Those feelings were most truly creditable to him. His chief ambition was to become Publisher to all the most thorough-going Churchmen, so that it was a real personal sorrow to him, when an Author, whose opinions he respected, went to another Firm. And secondly, he often let himself be influenced unduly by good nature, to help persons of straitened means, to bring their works before the public.

As a master, he was particularly kind and liberal, seldom changing those whom he employed in his office and shops. We should add, that Mr. Masters continued to the last to be a man of very simple habits. His place of business was his only residence, and there he died, after an illness of some months' duration, on Tuesday, August 25, surrounded by his family, and in the peace of CHRIST.

EDITOR OF THE ECCLESIASTIC.

STUART ON LOW MASSES.

Some Thoughts on Low Masses, Addressed to Members of Convocation. By the Rev. EDWARD STUART, M.A., Incumbent of S. Mary Magdalene's Church, Munster Square, Regent's Park. London: G. J. Palmer. 1863.

It is almost needless to profess our most cordial acceptance of the leading principle of Mr. Stuart's theory, the unapproachable pre-eminence of the Blessed Sacrament as the crown and centre of all Christian worship. All prayer, all praise, all ritual of the Church; all festival and ferial celebrations; all devotional practices, private or congregational, æsthetic or ascetic; are but reflections and representations, differing in degrees of dignity and efficacy, of the one only true and all-sufficient Sacrifice, slain from the foundation of the world, finished on the Cross of Calvary, offered up continually in Heaven by the One true Priest Who Himself is also the true Victim, Who in His natural Body has entered within the veil, and ever liveth there to make intercession through It; "shown forth," sacramentally, upon earth "for a continual remembrance," until the second coming of our LORD, on the ten thousand altars of the Catholic Church, in union with that heavenly intercession. So it is that not only the successors of the Apostles, who minister the Blessed Sacrament, but all faithful lay members of the Church who assist at it, whether by actual or spiritual communion, are in a very true and sufficient sense "a holy Priesthood." Nay, every confession of sin, every litany, every petition for grace, or even for any temporal blessing, every ordinary devotional act or office, every bowing the head or knee at the holy Name, every signing with the sign of the Cross, every collect brought to a conclusion "through the merits" or "mediation," is in very truth a sacerdotal act, an "offering up," a commemoration, and impleading, of the divine and heavenly Sacrifice.

The Holy Eucharist itself, of course, is infinitely more than this by virtue of the Sacramental Presence. It is the reality, not the shadow only of the heavenly substance. Other rites are but the types and figures of an absent "holy thing." The Blessed Sacrament is the living Body, closely united with the Spirit which gives it life, and makes it "life-giving." Those who are brought near to it in body or in spirit, must realize in the highest sense the fulfilment of the promise, "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them;" "I am really present, in a special manner, to bless, to sanctify, to heal, to be touched, to receive adoration, to hear and to grant the petitions of the faithful." If even "the shadow of S. Peter passing by," or

"handkerchiefs and aprons" taken from the body of S. Paul, had virtue going out of them to heal the sick and cast out unclean spirits, how much more that which is not the hem of the garment only, but the very Body and Blood itself of our incarnate, crucified, risen, and ascended SAVIOUR!

We most thoroughly agree then in Mr. Stuart's reiterated principle, that the "Eucharistic Sacrifice" is the chief, central, and characteristic act of Christian worship. We can quite understand his position, and appreciate his ideal; but we cannot overlook the fact that it is an ideal and nothing more, and we see no reasonable ground for entertaining a conception that it will ever become a reality with the generality of English people.

No one among us, however, has contributed more to popularize the higher view, and to effect this object, both by practice and precept, than Mr. Stuart. He was the first, we believe, practically to encourage the habitual attendance of non-communicants at both early and mid-day celebrations. We admire the clearness of his conception in this matter, and the boldness and energy with which he endeavours to carry it out; and to this extent we can go with him most thoroughly. But we can commend neither the wisdom nor justice of his unsparing denunciation of others among his brother priests who view the question on both sides, and for reverence' sake, would use more caution and prudence in modifying the prevailing practice;¹ nor much less of his resort, in any case, to physical compulsion, as if there were no danger of profanation in the forced presence of an unprepared promiscuous congregation.

Mr. Stuart has, in short, all the simple, naked perception of a great truth, the decisive singleness of purpose, the confidence of being right, the sanguine hopefulness of an earnest, enthusiastic disposition; but we are mistaken if he has not also a fair share of, we are far from saying the blind fanaticism, or "zeal without knowledge," (for he is most large and liberal minded, and well-informed, and thoroughly realizes his subject,) but the exaggeration, one-sidedness, impulsiveness, impatience, uncalculating disregard of qualifying circumstances, the lack of a due proportion of what Coleridge calls the "prudential" to balance the "moral" and the "spiritual," or of what is commonly called "practical common sense," more often than not belonging to the same character. The Divine proverbs cautionary against "casting pearls before swine," or "putting new wine into old bottles," do not seem to have entered into his philosophy. He appears utterly to discard a theory which, when propounded some quarter of a century ago, was received with very general satisfaction by our catholic-minded clergy, built on "indications of a superintending Providence in the preservation of the Prayer Book, and in the *changes* which it

¹ As in his Letter to the Rev. W. U. Richards, on the Presence of Non-communicants.

has undergone.”¹ He denies by implication the fact of its adaptation to the spiritual condition of the English people and the present age; and their unfitness for frequent and familiar participation in a more highly Eucharistic service.

At this point, then, we desire to call his attention, and that of our readers, to certain counter-considerations, which occur to us, and without due allowance for which we do not think he can make good his case. What is best absolutely and in the abstract, is not always so relatively to the needs and capabilities of particular persons. What is right and proper in a normal state of things, may, when irregularities have crept in, and all the parts have lost their first proportion, and are out of joint, require a corresponding modification to ensure their due effect. *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur cum illis*. The religious services and discipline which were perfect in the primitive and early Christian era, may have been less suited to the Mediæval; those of the middle ages be altogether unfit for the exigencies of the present day. There are such things too as national character and national habits, for which large allowances must be made. We are not at all prepared to admit that forms of religion which are attractive and popular to all or any of the peoples on the continent of Europe will be equally so to members of the Church of England. What can be wider apart than the attitude assumed by the Western and Eastern Churches respectively towards the Blessed Sacrament, as regards reserve and unreserve in the mode of celebration. There may be various gradations between the two extremes, in one of which the Church of England may have found, or be finding its proper place. All sudden changes in religious matters are almost certain to be unreal. We are far indeed from intending to imply that we ought not to go on advancing in the direction to which Mr. Stuart points. We are only fearful of too impetuously abandoning the vantage ground which, in God’s Providence, guiding the religious revival of the last thirty years, has been attained among us, for what may seem better and higher, but which we shall certainly fail to reach. Step by step our people have been following that Divine guidance towards a more excellent way. From “three times a year,” or quarterly, or at best, once a month, Holy Communion every Sunday is becoming more and more the common rule of our churches, and even daily celebrations are found in not a few. Neither can we see any reason why Mr. Stuart himself should not multiply the daily, or at least weekly celebrations at S. Mary Magdalene’s to the full extent necessary to test his own theory. We are not aware of any law, civil or ecclesiastical, preventing him, unless it be the rubric which requires a *minimum* number of communicants, so small, that if his theory be worth any thing, we presume he could find no difficulty in securing a sufficient number to attend.

¹ Tracts for the Times, No. 86.

If the practice he proposes would answer any where among us, surely it would answer in a London parish, or rather London congregation. Nothing would so recommend it to general adoption, as to witness its actual success. *Solvitur questio ambulando*. Such has been the course, for instance, by which the movement for "free and open churches" has worked¹ its way into popular acceptance. Why, then, should he not begin next week with a series of "Low Masses," commencing at five a.m., hour by hour, so long as in accordance with canon law he can? What we object to is the endeavour to exalt what is really a matter of theory by disparagement of our present actual system. Those among us who retain a grateful memory how so many years ago they were suddenly brought, as it were, into a new and holier world by regular attendance on the "Daily Service," and trace most of their deepest religious habits and growth in grace to the continued use of that privilege, will be somewhat shocked, we fancy, and feel as if an insult had been offered to their best friend, to find what they have cherished exceedingly as the source of such sweet spiritual experiences, thus scoffed at contemptuously and laughed out of court as if next to worthless, by Mr. Stuart: "Would that we could see our town clergy called to a more grateful and a more useful task than that of reading Morning Prayer daily to two or three ladies, who, they know, might almost as well read it for themselves at home!" (p. 17.) Mr. Stuart must certainly have not an unworthy only but an altogether misconceived idea of the principle of the "daily service," such as it is, when he can speak of it as a "task" to be measured by its "usefulness," and of its being "read" daily to two or three ladies! Such disparagement of its value by comparison with the Holy Eucharist reminds one of the invidious contrasts which are sometimes drawn between the Bible and the Prayer Book, or Sundays and Saints' Days, as if somehow a high appreciation of the latter were an implied dishonouring of the former gifts!

We shall have somewhat to add on this aspect of the subject before the conclusion of the present article. Our main purpose at present is to point out certain qualifying circumstances which are omitted from Mr. Stuart's calculation, but which will at once account for very much of the apparent failure of our present system, and forbid any reasonable hope of any sudden or extensive improvement in this respect by substitution of the system which he advocates.

1. In the first place, for instance, he makes no sufficient allowance, for *the religious divisions* of the English people. This is a most important consideration in comparing their attendance on public worship, whether on week days or Sundays, with that of foreign nations, where the bulk of the population holds the faith in

¹ We refer especially to the crowded meeting held on the last day of August, in the town-hall of Shrewsbury.

unity of spirit. No doubt, speaking generally, a larger number of worshippers frequents the early "Masses" in continental churches, than attends our "daily service," especially in country places. Not only is the number of our congregations lessened in every parish by so many families deducted as not being members of our communion, but the example of sectarian bodies whose religious observances are limited to "the Sabbath," must seriously influence their neighbour churchmen to be satisfied with the same meagre fare. As regards Sunday itself, we question whether a census of the number attending *every* place of worship, whatever the particular "denomination," would not show a much larger proportion in this country than in any on the continent. We do not say that that larger proportion could not be very considerably increased by a multiplication of services in the same church, shorter and at earlier hours. We agree with almost every thing that Mr. Stuart urges on this point. It is one on which Mr. Beresford Hope, among other active churchmen, has been insisting for some years past. Only we do not see any reason to conclude that the purpose of attracting numbers, and of a poorer class, would be accomplished more successfully, by limiting such services to a series of "Low Masses."

2. Another important difference not in any way allowed for, is *the absence of compulsory confession and of all private discipline among ourselves.* Mr. Stuart indeed affirms this to be an advantage on our side, "That confession and celibacy should be made voluntary instead of compulsory." (P. 2.) On the other hand, he deploras very earnestly that "the old rule of Christian worship, the definite direction given for the guidance of all men of good will about their duty to God on Sundays, was set aside (at the Reformation,) and no other direction given in its place!" This assertion about our need of "a definite rule of worship" is again and again repeated, as one of his three chief points (pp. 5—11;) and is, we think, one of the most gratuitous and unjust in the whole pamphlet. What rule can be more definite than that of the Preface to the Prayer Book, "And all Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause. And the Curate that ministereth in every Parish Church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a Bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begins, that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him." We cannot conceive any rule of worship more "definite" than this; and this is further enforced by laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, (happily dormant) under severe penalties upon disobedience. It is most untrue then to say that "men were left to themselves without any rule whatever in this matter" (p. 7;) and when it is said invidiously, "no Roman Catholic, who has

been but ordinarily instructed in his religious duties, can have any doubt whatever what act of worship he ought to offer on Sunday to God" (p. 9), we can answer in all good conscience, so neither is there any ordinarily instructed English churchman who can have the smallest doubt upon the question. The real difference between the parties is, that, while there is an equally definite rule in England for both priest and people, the loss of compulsory confession and therefore of private spiritual direction, among ourselves, involves the loss also of perhaps the strongest practical obligation to the observance of the rule.

3. And, since the *celibacy of the clergy* has been referred to, we must object further, that neither has any allowance been made for our difference in this respect. He supposes the case of five or six clergy attached to a single church; and he says, "Why may we not have two such Rubrics as these inserted in the Prayer Book? viz., first, 'Every priest in cure of souls shall celebrate the Holy Eucharist daily in the church or chapel in which he ministers, not being hindered by sickness or other serious cause;' and secondly, 'Every parishioner shall attend at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist once upon all Sundays and on the greater Holy Days.' Not one word of the prayers of our service need be altered; but we might find a new spirit and a new life in them; and clergymen who are now disheartened at the thankless and seemingly profitless task assigned them (!) in reading out daily Morning Prayer to empty churches, might find a new sphere of religious energy and usefulness in the offices of public worship themselves, seeing them no longer deserted by the people, but attended day by day by those who would rejoice to be welcomed back once again to the house and service of God." (P. 23.) We must remark here again on the singular obliquity of vision betrayed by the writer, as regards the principle of our present 'daily service.' We must observe also, that the proposed new rubrics would be neither more "definite" nor obligatory than the one already quoted from the Preface to the Prayer Book. We see no reason for supposing that they would secure a readier obedience on the part either of our priests or people. The point, however, to which under this head we would draw attention is, that there is one rule for the priest, and another for the people. The priest is required to celebrate, and therefore to *receive*, Holy Communion *every day*; the people are still to be left to their present obligation, to communicate at least *three times a year*, of which Easter shall be one. What is there in fact to justify this distinction? There seems to be an implied recognition of the principle, that a different kind or degree of preparation and fitness is required for simple attendance at the Celebration, and for receiving the Blessed Sacrament; but if few of our lay people are fitted for the exceeding responsibility of a daily Communion, what moral peculiarity is there that

would justify our forming a more favourable opinion of the bulk of our parish clergy? Do they for the most part lead a less secular and worldly life than our faithful laity? Are their domestic duties such that they could, for the most part, wait upon the Lord without distraction? Is there not some weight, applying *à fortiori* to the Holy Eucharist, in the condition made to David by the priest of Nob before allowing him and his young men to partake of the hallowed bread?¹

We cannot but conclude that the celibacy of the clergy is a necessary correlative of an enforced daily celebration. When then Mr. Stuart agrees with us that "we have great cause to be thankful that confession and celibacy should be made voluntary instead of compulsory," he is really relinquishing two of the most effectual safeguards, not to say the necessary conditions, of a successful working of his theory.

4. Neither, again, does he sufficiently allow for the different *social habits* of our people. If there is one national distinctive characteristic more fully developed than another it is our singular addiction to hard work. From the hour of their rising, the British labourer and artizan go forth to their work and labour until the evening. Sad as is the confession, (and we are explaining, not defending, the prevailing system,) they have scarcely a spare moment in the morning to spend upon an act of worship, whether in church or out. On the other hand, it is equally remarkable that, speaking generally, wherever the Roman system prevails as the national religion, there the habits of the people are such as in this country we should, rightly or wrongly, stigmatize as idle. This then is a circumstance which, perhaps least of all, should be overlooked, in comparing the popular religious observances of one people with those of any other. That Catholics on the continent are found ready to go to "Mass" is no sufficient proof whatever that the bulk of our people would be the same, if the same opportunities were offered them in England.

5. Another most important item omitted in his reckoning is the allowance which ought to be made for the *national character* of the people. This by the universal consent of our European neighbours is an excessive *reserve*. Whether it be owing to pride, or to lack of proper self-reliance, or to some better quality than either, is beside the present question. If in matter of fact it be really peculiar to the English people, it at once puts us in strong contrast with the continental nations as regards all outward religious observances and practices. It accounts for the characteristic *subjectivity* of our popular religion. Not only do the all-absorbing business habits of the masses preclude all hope of "those half-hours of prayer passed day by day in the house of God, in the stillness of the early morning," but the natural disposition of the

¹ 1 Sam. xxi. 4.

more religious sort would lead them to find a vent for their spiritual emotions in the privacy of their chambers, or in the solitary musing of their own hearts. Mr. Stuart draws comparisons between the "family prayers" of English domestic life and the attendance at mass in foreign countries. The contrast rather should have been between the *private prayers* of religious English people and what may be called the *public-private-prayers* of foreigners. Not only are foreigners less domestic in their habits, they are the very opposite of *reserved*. We sometimes have imagined that the excessive religious reserve peculiar to Englishmen may be the direct consequence of their religious differences. The feuds and strife and petty persecutions to which each sect and school within the Church have been subjected in turn, have forced earnest individuals in self-defence to keep their religion as much as possible out of sight. Certainly personal religion among us, as compared with that of foreigners, takes altogether a different form and character, and would not find a natural outlet either in the usage of attending mass, or praying "privately" in churches.

Such, briefly stated, appear to us very weighty offsets to the wisdom of Mr. Stuart's theory. We have no expectation that his suggestions will be followed by any practical results but one; and that one a very serious evil. We mean, a certain discredit thrown on our present "Daily Service." There are many among us who, discouraged by its apparent failure, are only restrained from quietly dropping it by a sense of obedience to the Church's "definite rule;" and who will too readily still their qualms of conscience in giving it up by a theoretic admiration of the higher Act of Worship for which it was substituted at the Reformation, but which the present requirements of the Prayer Book, as they will argue, render impracticable. We say emphatically, "*apparent failure*;" for to those only who have ceased to regard it in its *objective* character, as an act of homage offered up to God, can it appear "a useless task," whether the worshippers attending it be few or many. The real question is, as we have stated, whether larger numbers and of a poorer class would be attracted by the higher service. We have given certain reasons for a contrary opinion. Mr. Stuart, indeed, *asserts* that, prior to the Reformation, "Low Masses had drawn crowds of worshippers to our churches, on week days as well as Sundays," (p. 1.) We challenge him to produce historical authority for his assertion. It is only reasonable to conjecture that the substitution of a new system seemed to be justified by the failure or practical abuses of the old one. But be it so or not, our argument has been that our people *at present* are not ripe for the more objective and Eucharistic service; that our present use is a great safeguard against irreverence and presumption; that it is suited to the reserve and subjectiveness of the national character; that an advance on it must be gradual, by piecemeal, and

in the order of God's Providence. After all, the Daily Service has scarcely yet been re-established among us a sufficiently long time to judge of its success or failure, even on the low ground of popularity. The Kalendar of the English Church Union publishes as long a list as might reasonably have been expected of churches where it is already practised; and the number both of churches, and of worshippers attending it, is we believe continually on the increase. No doubt much remains to be done to render it generally more acceptable and attractive by improved ritual, the abolition of the pew system, and the use of hours suited to the people. But a whole generation of Churchmen must pass away, and others who have grown up in the system from the beginning take their place, before we can apply such a test of its success or failure. Even, then, as we have hinted, for the reasons already stated, peculiarly applicable to the condition and character of the English people, we see sufficient grounds for not entertaining a very sanguine hope of any large measure of success.¹ We must be content still to find personal religion in England manifesting itself in a practical rather than a devotional form, and in private and social life rather than demonstratively; in "visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction and keeping himself unspotted from the world." It will be a blessed thing, if, in the abeyance of a still more complete and effectual discipline, our churches shall still stand open, and the penitent find a daily opportunity of cleansing himself from sin by public confession and absolution; of offering up his daily prayers for grace in union with the All-sufficient Sacrifice and Heavenly Intercession; and of pouring forth his thanksgivings and praises in inspired words, and in joint worship with "an innumerable company of angels." Above all, we desire to see restored what Mr. Stuart seems rather to undervalue, the Ordinance of Confession. By all means lead on the people as you best can, to a due reverence and longing for the higher service; but not by a depreciation of that which, though a lower, is still a most blessed and effectual means of spiritual communion.

¹ In point of fact their relative popularity has been tried under circumstances most favourable to those who hold Mr. Stuart's views, and what is the result? As far as we have been able to ascertain the attendance at Matins, where there is also a Daily Celebration, is five or six fold what it is at the latter Service; and in fact we only know of one instance where a Daily Celebration has been attempted without a body of sisters to support it.

HYMNS FOR THE CHURCH.

The Holy Year ; or, Hymns for Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year, and for other Occasions. Third Edition. Rivingtons.

THIS elegant volume, which bears on its exterior the name of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, has only reached us in the "third edition," or it certainly would have received, what it is abundantly entitled to, an early notice.

The study of hymnology has followed the same course as that of architecture. When this latter science began to emerge, some thirty years ago, from beneath the conservative brush of the white-washer and the destructive ravages of neglect and abuse, the only safe course for church builders or restorers was to copy the models which lay around them in rich profusion: our better architects are now beginning, not with universal success, to invent.

So it has been with hymnology. The editors of the "Hymnal Noted" were quite right in confining themselves strictly to translations, and in making their translations preserve the same metre as their respective originals, so that each hymn might be sung to its proper melody. The result however, can scarcely be said to have been satisfactory. It is not so easy to reproduce in language as it is in stone or wood. And consequently there are not many of the hymns in that collection which promise to attain to popularity.

Again, as Dr. Wordsworth notices in his Preface, the Chronology of the Latin Hymns has not been accurately marked.

"The critical study of ancient Hymnology has not yet attained its proper proportions among us.

"In support of this statement it may be mentioned that many Hymns have been printed in England as '*ancient*,' and even as '*primitive*,' which are not two centuries old.¹ This has arisen, in part, from the following circumstances ;

"Some of our Hymn-writers have resorted to the Gallican Breviaries, and have translated into English the Hymns which they have found there ; and some Editors of Hymns have published those Hymns as '*Hymns of the Primitive Church*.' But it does not seem to have occurred to them that many of those Gallican Breviaries underwent a complete revolution in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially in their Hymns.

"The Archbishops and Bishops of France followed the example of Pope Urban VIII., who altered the Hymns of the Roman Breviary in the middle of the seventeenth century ; and they went far beyond him, in dealing with the Breviaries of their dioceses.

"The '*Parisian Breviary*' passed through more changes than any

¹ "Among a hundred Hymns, entitled '*Hymns of the Primitive Church*,' at least fifty are not older than our own '*New Version of the Psalms*.'"

other, first under Archbishop Harlay, and, after him, under Cardinal de Noailles, at the end of the seventeenth century, and, lastly, under one of his successors in the see of Paris, Charles de Vintimille, who published his edition of the Breviary in four volumes, at Paris, 'cum privilegio Regis,' in 1736.

"This Breviary, which was adopted by twenty-three French dioceses, contains a large number of Latin Hymns, by modern French writers, such as J. B. de Santeul, and Charles Coffin, rector of the University of Paris, who died in 1749.

"The Preface to this Breviary states that *modern hymns*¹ have occasionally been *preferred* to *ancient* ones, but it gives no clue to the authorship of the Hymns contained in those four volumes; and the old and new materials are so blended together, that it is not possible to discriminate them, except by collation with more ancient Liturgies.

"Hence the mistake has arisen which has propagated itself so widely in England; and it is a singular fact, that we are now singing in our churches not a few Hymns as ancient, which were written in France under Louis XIV. and Louis XV.; and which since that time have been discarded by the French Church, which has cast off her Diocesan Breviaries, and has adopted the Roman Breviary in their stead.

"The 'Parisian Breviary' has supplied more materials than almost any other to many of our translators of Latin Hymns; and its eighteenth century Hymns have been published in this country as 'Hymns of the Primitive Church.'

"Some of those Hymns are good specimens of Christian Poetry: this is not denied; but the reception of them as *ancient* seems to show that more of research is needed, than we have yet made, in this department of Sacred Literature, before we can expect to see a suitable Hymn Book for the general use of the Anglican Church."—Pp. xxviii. —xxxi.

Many modern hymnals—especially that by Mr. Trend—have borrowed largely from Mr. Isaac Williams' translations from the Hymns of the Parisian Breviary. The originals are on the whole poor; and hymn writing is not Mr. Williams' forte.

The time is come now, however, when we shall gladly see those who have drunk deepest of the literature of the early Church employ themselves in composing some original hymns for the Church Service.

It is to be borne in mind, that the Breviary was not intended for the use of large miscellaneous congregations, and so it is reasonable to expect that some change will be required corresponding to the alteration of circumstances, before the singing of hymns can attain its proper place with us.

Dr. Wordsworth possesses many qualifications for labouring in this which, as a whole, we may call an untried field. He is well

¹ " 'Veteribus Hymnis locus datus est, nisi quibus, ob sententiarum vim, elegantiam verborum, et teneriores pietatis sensus, *recentes* anteponi satius visum est.' —Preface to *Parisian Breviary*, p. 7, ed. 1778."

acquainted with the entire range of Christian *literature*, and has certainly inherited from his uncle both a musical ear, and no mean share of imagination. From the universality of his knowledge however, we must except liturgiology and ritualism, for which we apprehend, he has no taste. It is owing to this defect that he has introduced too much of the historical element into his hymns, and has attempted to turn narratives into verse, which no form of poetry, except the ballad, could hope to deal with. "The Holy Year" must have been composed in the midst of gigantic literary labours; and we have no doubt that every new edition will materially improve the versification. But the fault that we have referred to is too radical to admit of *correction*. The following instance, taken out of many, will illustrate our remarks. In the hymn for S. Bartholomew's Day, after seven really beautiful stanzas, we have the following :

"Then why repine, though none can here
On earth thy story tell,
Bartholomew?—*whom also some*
Would call Nathanael."

With most of Dr. Wordsworth's principles we quite agree. His strictures on the subjectivity of modern Hymns and Collections (we wish that we could exempt "Hymns Ancient and Modern" from the charge) are admirable.

"It was said by a great preacher, Dr. Isaac Barrow, that the personal and possessive pronouns *I* and *mine* ought never or very rarely to appear in a *sermon*. And this observation seems to be still more applicable to such *Hymns* as are designed for *public* worship. A Hymn, in *public* worship, is the collective voice of the Congregation speaking to God, and singing His praise, or supplicating His grace. Every member of a Christian congregation is bound to profess his faith individually, and therefore every one says in the Creeds, '*I believe.*' But 'when ye *pray*' (is the precept of CHRIST) 'say, *Our FATHER* ;'¹ and the primary object of prayer is GOD's glory,—not our own good. 'Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done.' The LORD's *prayer* may and ought to be a pattern also for *praise*. The Hymns of Holy Scripture are free from *egotism*. The Angels *forget themselves* in worshipping God. 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace, goodwill towards men.' 'Holy, Holy, Holy, is the LORD of Hosts, the whole Earth is full of His glory.'² The Church triumphant thanks GOD for His great glory;³ and while she duly remembers what the Lamb, who has been slain, has done for her,

¹ S. Matt. vi. 9.

² Isa. vi. 3.

³ "This characteristic of heavenly worship is appropriately adopted in the Eucharistic '*Gloria in excelsis*,'—'We give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory.' S. Augustine's definition of a Hymn is,—'*Hymnus est cantus cum laude Dei; si cantas, et non laudas Deum, non dicis Hymnum; si laudas aliquid quod non pertinet ad laudem Dei, non dicis Hymnum;*' in Ps. cxlviii."

it is not by decomposing herself into individuals, and disintegrating herself into atoms, that she glorifies Him, but by an universal chorus of praise for the salvation He has wrought *for the whole company* of faithful people in every Nation under heaven. 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed *us*¹ to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made *us*¹ unto our God kings and priests.'—Pp. xxxvi., xxxvii.

Further on he writes :

"If it should be objected in reply to these observations that the personal and possessive pronouns *I* and *my* are often found in other Psalms, of an eucharistic character, it ought to be borne in mind, that the Psalms are words of the HOLY SPIRIT Himself, speaking by a Prophet and a King, the Royal Ancestor of CHRIST, and not unfrequently speaking in the Name of CHRIST² and of the Church, and collecting the whole body of the faithful in himself. Those pronouns, as used by David, serve for the most part to declare the *unity* of the Church *Universal*."³—P. xli.

Again his remarks on metres are very admirable.

"It was an ancient rhythmical principle, that the Tetrameter Trochaic of fifteen syllables should be specially employed on occasions where there is a sudden burst of feeling, after a patient waiting, or a continuous struggle. This Metre never finds its place at the beginning, but is reserved for a later period in the Drama, both Tragic and Comic, of the ancient Stage.⁴ The long rapid sweep of this noble Metre, and the jubilant movement of the verse, render it very suitable for use on the great Festivals of the Christian Year, such as Easter and Ascension,⁵ when, after severe trial, or quiet endurance, the Church is suddenly cheered by a glorious vision which gladdens her heart, and evokes a song of rapture from her lips.

¹ "Rev. v. 9, 10. The pronoun '*us*' is very doubtful, in both these verses, as may be seen by an examination of the manuscript authorities; in the former it ought probably to be *omitted*, in the latter it ought to be '*them*.' This strengthens the above remarks on the *self-forgetfulness* of genuine worship."

² "See Bp. Horne's Preface to his Commentary on the Psalms, pp. xli.—xliv., ed. London, 1844."

³ "This is well expressed by Hengstenberg, who says on Psalm iii., 'David coined for the Church the gold bestowed on himself.' And, again, in his Essay on the Designations, Contents, &c., of the Psalms at the end of his third volume, he observes that 'David was the organ of the Church, the man raised on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob; David, in whom the community is represented as its head . . . David describes himself in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2, as speaking by the Spirit of God; and this was the principle declared by our Lord (S. Matt. xxii. 41—46), and our Lord's reference to the Psalms (S. Luke xx. 44) rests on the supposition that they were composed by Divine Inspiration, and had reference to Himself, and were therefore received into the Canon of the Church.'"

⁴ "See Bentley's Preface to his edition of Terence, p. v., '*illud admonendum, ut a Trimetris (iambis) suas fabulas nostrum inchoasse, ita semper Tetrametris (trochaicis) finiisse.*'"

⁵ "It is therefore employed on those Festivals in the present Volume; see below, p. 103, and p. 129; and p. 268, the Festival of 'All Saints,' which is the last Saint's-day in the year, and reveals the Church in glory."

"But it may well admit of a doubt, whether this trochaic measure is appropriate at such solemn seasons as that in which the Christian Church is meditating on the awful transactions of the Day of Judgment. And yet the Hymn on the *Second* Advent, which is most familiar to English ears, is composed in a tetrameter trochaic broken into two parts, and rendered more joyful by double rhymes,—

‘Lo! He comes with clouds descending,
Once for favour’d sinners slain.’¹

The mention of this Hymn may introduce the remark that the magnificent ancient tetrameter trochaic of fifteen syllables, to which reference has just been made, has now unfortunately, but almost universally, been broken into two parts, the former consisting of eight, the latter of seven syllables. This bi-section of the verse,—which seems to have been occasioned by the exigencies of Printing, not being able to include the fifteen syllables in narrow double columns,—has been a serious evil to Hymnology. Let any one read a tetrameter trochaic of Æschylus, or of the Christian poet Prudentius,² or of the glorious ancient Hymn ‘Pange, lingua,’³ first as the authors wrote them, in lines of fifteen syllables, and then let him break up each line into two parts, and he will immediately perceive how much he has lost both in sound and sense by this process of disruption. The majestic flow of the line which bore the reader onward, as on a smooth and rapid current, is suddenly checked, as by a reef or bar thrown across it.

"It is remarkable that this ancient tetrameter trochaic, consecrated by the use of the early Christian Church, does not find a place in its genuine form, as far as the writer is aware, in any of the modern manuals of popular English Hymnology."—Pp. xliii.—xli.

In respect to one principle which has very largely influenced Dr. Wordsworth in the arrangement of “The Holy Year,” we must beg respectfully to differ from him—i.e., in the desirability of making the hymn for each Sunday (he seems to forget that we require more than one) harmonize exactly with the Services of the

¹ “How much grander is ‘Luther’s Hymn,’ with its *spondaic* movement,—‘Great God, what do I see and hear!’ and how much more appropriate! The Author has attempted to apply this principle in Hymn 3, p. 5, below, ‘for the Second Advent;’ in lines of ten syllables, of *iambics* and *spondees*.”

² “E.g. his beautiful Cathemerinon ix.,—

‘Da puer plectrum, choreis ut canam fidelibus
Dulce carmen et melodum, gesta Christi insignia :
Hunc camena nostra solum pangat, hunc laudet lyra.’

Thus the Hymn is very properly printed by Dressel in his recent edition of Prudentius, p. 53, ed. Lips. 1860. In some former editions of Prudentius each line is dismembered, for the convenience of printing.”

³ “‘Pange, lingua, gloriosi proelium certaminis,
Et super crucis trophæo dic triumphum nobilem.’

See Clichtoveus, p. 30, where it is printed in double columns, and consequently broken up; but Daniel (Thes. Hymnol. i. p. 163) has judiciously restored it to its ancient tetrameter form.”

day. This principle is intelligible enough, and may be carried out with success, when any one portion of the Service is selected according to a certain scheme. Thus the Gospels for Advent describe various signs and results of CHRIST's coming, (though this by the way, is not the teaching of the season which Dr. Wordsworth versifies) and so might furnish matter for hymns, which would be strictly suitable to the season. Again the Gospels for the Sundays after Epiphany relate to different manifestations of CHRIST's glory when He was on earth, and would admit of similar treatment. So in fact Dr. Wordsworth has made them the theme for the hymns during the season. He would have done better however, we think, if he had not treated the parable which forms the Gospel for the fifth Sunday exegetically, but rather as an illustration of CHRIST's *wisdom*, as the miracles which are appointed to be read on some of the other Sundays, are of His *power*.

In all these instances, it will be observed, it is one portion of the Service alone that is made the subject of a hymn, and that bearing directly upon the season. Very different is the case when we come to some of the other Sundays, particularly to those after Trinity. Here the hymn very often is a cento of the Epistle and Gospel and First Lesson; sometimes of the Morning and Evening Lessons combined. There is nothing in these specially suitable to the season; and the mere versification of parts of the Service, even if it could be poetry, seems to be open to precisely the same objection as the attempts of Sternhold and Brady to turn the Psalms of David into metre. Further there is no principle whatever to guide a hymn writer in selecting the Lesson rather than the Gospel or the Gospel rather than the Epistle.

We part company from Dr. Wordsworth with quoting the introductory stanzas, before referred to, for S. Bartholomew's Day—not by any means because there are not many more that we admire as much, but because they illustrate what we consider to be one of the happy characteristics of our author—the way in which he works up the typical resemblances of the Old Testament.

- “The tribes of Israël revered
 Twelve Patriarchal names,
 When God call'd Moses at the bush,
 Forth from the burning flames.
- “Twelve bright clear Wells at Elim flow'd
 Beneath the Palm-tree shade;
 Where, marching through the desert sand,
 They their encampment made.
- “Twelve Standards stood around the Camp,
 And round the holy Tent,
 And when they mov'd, the Church of God
 Forth on her journey went.

"Twelve Spies were sent by Moses forth,
To search the Promis'd Land;
Twelve Stones at Joshua's word were rais'd
From parted Jordan's sand.

"Twelve Loaves of holy Bread were plac'd
Before the veiled Throne;
Twelve precious Gems of brilliant hue
In Aaron's Breastplate shone.

"Twelve Oxen bore the molten sea,
With outward-looking eyes,
Type of the Fount, with which the Twelve
Would the whole World baptize.

"Twelve Thrones are promis'd to the Twelve
Who true to CHRIST remain,
And will the Tribes of Israel judge,
When CHRIST shall come again."—Pp. 248, 249.

DR. GOULBURN ON THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

The Office of the Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer : a series of Lectures delivered in the Church of S. John the Evangelist, Puddington, by E. M. GOULBURN, D.D., Prebendary of S. Paul's, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains in ordinary. 2 vols. London : Rivingtons, 1863.

Soon after the commencement of the Catholic movement, which the 'Times' for a short time affected to patronize, we were edified by sundry leading articles in that journal on the state and condition of the clergy, the type of the two predominant parties being described respectively as 'Dr. High and Dry,' and 'Mr. Low and Slow.' A lapse of some twenty years has so changed the aspect of the Church, that what was then a perfectly defined and well known class, exercising very considerable influence in the Church, is now almost confined to those whose admission to Holy Orders dates within the first quarter of the present century. Dr. High and Dry still lingers about our Cathedral Closes, and may be found in many country Rectories; but he leaves no genuine successor in the younger clergy; the wholesale revolution effected by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and still more the revival of Catholic principles

have created a new state of things which leaves little room for the growth of such a character. The Catholic party, however, should not forget how much it owed to the *vis inertia* of those divines, as well as to their having maintained, in opposition to the levelling practices of the Low Churchman, the supremacy of the Church. They had preserved, if only coldly and traditionally, some of the great sacramental doctrines, especially that on which the first battle was fought—Baptismal Regeneration. Taking them generally they were men of birth and education, many, far more, of real learning: their sermons were well written, and often well preached; they could write a pamphlet or a book on any question of the day, with ability and force. As far as *traditionary* use went, they were careful to have the Church Services correct, and to go through them with dignity, though often with painful coldness. To make religion respectable, and to preserve the dignified position of the ‘established Church,’ was the chief end and aim of their ministrations: a thorough dislike of dissent, and of those Low Church Clergy, who sympathised with it, made them avoid anything like zeal or even improvement; they were ready to endure an apathetic state of religion, through a fear of revolution. The books and tracts of the S.P.C.K. such as they were twenty or thirty years ago, are perhaps the best reflection of their principles, both as to language and doctrine; if the latter was, on the whole sound, it was conceived in words above the comprehension of the uneducated. At the same time there was a certain value in this, as the language was commonly that of the older divines, such as Pearson, Bull and Taylor, and other giants of the seventeenth century. Thus they preserved the well-defined outline, though it was only in most cases an outline, which Anglo-Catholics soon filled up with the warm colouring of glowing truth. It is a remarkable instance of the conservative character of Englishmen, that after they had ceased to teach the deeper truths of sacramental doctrine, and to enforce the living reality in the life and soul, they still preserved the outward expression in language. They would enunciate the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, of Absolution, nay, of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, but entirely failed to make them of vital importance in the inner life of the Christian. This was most painfully evident in the Great Sacrament, where, in order to maintain their favourite position of being equally removed from Romanism on the one hand, and Calvinism on the other, as they loved to describe themselves, they evacuated the Sacrament of its essential features, and pared it down to a mere ordinary means of grace, and a commemoration of the sacrifice of CHRIST; never realizing its essentially sacrificial character, nor regarding it as the crowning act of Christian worship. As a necessary consequence the celebration was confined to a few of the greater Festivals, and some dozen Sundays in the year, always on Good Friday; in all cases carefully restricted to

the recipients. Under such a system as this, and especially coupled with the most perfunctory preparation for Confirmation, the communicants naturally dwindled down to those of the higher classes in the congregation, and to the older of the lower: youths and maidens of the latter were seldom seen as Communicants.

The Catholic movement has, however, swept on with such overwhelming force, that even this body has been unable to resist its influence; and younger members, who under the old system would have been like their predecessors, have been obliged to drop much of the stiffness and formality of the older school, and to imbibe a warmth and vigour unknown to it. Not only is the language changed, but a far greater spiritual apprehension of the reality of the sacramental system infused into their minds, and a far greater earnestness of purpose manifested. The lectures before us afford an excellent index of the class last described: they are carefully prepared, well written, and were, we have no doubt, ably preached; to a certain point they are sound; they manifest throughout that quality which no doubt Dr. Goulburn prides himself on possessing—moderation. But we cannot help fearing that in his anxiety to appear moderate, he is content with a low standard of doctrine. Thus we have the favourite expression, occurring more than once, “thankfulness . . for the position, in which Divine Providence has placed us as members of the Church of England,” and well balanced views of Scriptural truth,” equally remote from the Romanizing and Rationalising tendencies of the day, &c., &c.,” which so eminently characterise the moderate man of our day. To put himself, and to try to put the Church, in this Mohammed-coffin-like position, is with him of far greater importance, than to maintain fearlessly the Catholic faith. Like the modern British statesman, who to preserve a fancied ‘balance of power’ in Europe, labours to prop up the rotten, corrupt, barbarous empire of Turkey, to the great detriment of Christianity; so these divines, in order to keep themselves in an imaginary *equilibrio*, are quite prepared to sacrifice a large amount of Catholic truth.

Do these divines ever seriously consider the position in which they place themselves? Do they not see that as Rationalism advances further into Infidelity, so they must advance likewise in the same direction, in order to keep up the balance? Is it not plain that two branches of the Catholic Church must have far more in common—to take the lowest ground—with each other, than with any phase of unbelief and Rationalism? Rome holds all truth, the points that we disagree with her are exaggerations of truth: Rationalism, in its different phases, denies all truth: can we maintain any “well-balanced views . . . equally remote” from these two points, and maintain all truth at the same time? The thing is impossible. Besides, in considering this question, the other Branch of the Catholic Church must be brought in; what

place does she hold in thus adjusting the scales? Dr. Goulburn ignores her altogether, but the fact of her existence is fatal to his theory.

Though we knew very well that Dr. Goulburn's principles had far more of a Protestant tendency than a Catholic, we were not prepared to find him call the doctrine of Transubstantiation a "heresy," (Vol. II. p. 130;) nor did we expect to read such strange notions as are contained in the second lecture. Here he goes far beyond Lord Shaftesbury's celebrated "Lydian Meetings:" he actually tells us that the Holy Eucharist was a mere adjunct to the common every-day evening meal—if we understand him rightly—without the formal consecration of a priest; and he gives what he calls an "interesting anecdote" from the life of Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley; who, on the occasion of two friends calling on him, and the servant bringing in luncheon, which consisted of bread and wine, "seemed seized by an uncontrollable impulse, and breaking the bread and pouring out the wine, delivered it to them with the customary Eucharistic formulary: 'The Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, which was given for thee; the Blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST which was shed for thee.'" He adds the saying of the narrator, 'that it was the most solemn and impressive Sacrament he had ever received.' Surely, it would have been better to have said, it was the highest profanation of a Sacrament he had ever beheld. But Dr. Goulburn not only accounts for it as being done by "men in a high state of spiritual feeling," but also as a "momentary return to the quite primitive state of things, before the Sacrament was disconnected from the meal." With such notions as these, there is no extravagance of the wildest revivalism, no profanity of a Methodist camp-meeting, which may not be accounted for, as "a return to the quite primitive state of things;" for did not the by-standers at the Day of Pentecost say, "These men are full of new wine?"

A great deal of this irreverence on the part of Dr. Goulburn, in his idea of the Holy Eucharist, and its celebration, arises from his ignorance—we use the word advisedly, though he writes D.D. after his name. He lays it down, quite correctly, that as the Church was developed from the Jewish community, so the Eucharist succeeded the Passover: but he supposes that the true type of the Passover was its first celebration in Egypt, and that therefore it was merely a social meal, and not a sacrifice; and that it was celebrated according to the pattern of Egypt after the building of the Temple. Had he consulted such a common book as Lightfoot—surely he is a good Protestant authority—he would have known better: nay, had he read the Book of Deuteronomy with any degree of attention, he could not have made such mistakes as he does. In that Book the Israelites are told that the whole state of things previous to their entering on their inheritance was

temporary and imperfect ; e.g. Deut. xii. 8, "Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes. For ye are not come to the rest and to the inheritance, which the LORD your God giveth you. But when ye go over Jordan . . . then there shall be a place which the LORD your God shall choose to cause His name to dwell there ; thither shall ye bring all that I command you, your burnt-offerings and your sacrifices," &c., &c. Again, more particularly respecting the Passover, (xvi. 5,) "Thou mayest not sacrifice [*marg.* kill] the Passover within any of thy gates . . . but at the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place His name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the Passover at even," &c. Accordingly the lamb was sacrificed in the court of the temple, its blood poured out at the foot of the altar, the fat, &c., burnt, and each one of the company—a company consisted of thirty persons—ate a piece at least of the size of an olive. The Passover-supper which accompanied this was, of course, a social meal, prepared and eaten at home, but the Passover-lamb was sacrificed in the "place that the LORD shall choose," i.e. the Temple. Does Dr. Goulburn suppose that the blood was sprinkled on all the doorposts of every house in Palestine ? It is his ignorance of these facts, that makes him assume, apparently without question, that our LORD ate the Sacrifice of the Passover at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, and that the hymn that He and His disciples sang after supper was the Great Hallel: the Great Hallel was always sung in the court of the temple after the Sacrifice was completed.

The same ignorance leads him into the error that we before mentioned, that the Eucharists of the first years of the Church were the type of all succeeding, and that our custom of celebrating on an altar in a church is a departure from the primitive custom, caused by abuses,—e.g. like that S. Paul rebukes at Corinth,—which afterwards crept in. This notion naturally follows from his considering that the Passover in Egypt was the proper type, instead of being an adaptation to circumstances, and done in a great emergency, because there was no temple, and no (Levitical) priesthood: we might as well say that the exceptional case of a celebration in a heathen land and in a rude hut on the top of a sea chest is the type, and the celebration in a Church after the mission is established, the innovation. The Apostles had to adapt their celebration to the state of constant danger they were in for "fear of the Jews:" when this fear, and that from heathen persecution ceased, then, as was the case with Israel, when they came "to the rest and the inheritance" which the LORD gave them, they "did not do after all the things," that they did in the exceptional case.

We now come to the more pleasing task of showing what are the good points in these Lectures. Dr. Goulburn writes with warmth and vigour, and evidently in strong earnest: he would

wish to see more frequent and more reverent celebrations every where; he would make it the great privilege as well as the great blessing which the Church has to bestow on her children: with him the Eucharist is far more than a mere remembrance, it is the high act of Communion with CHRIST. We did not expect to find that he had attained to a high belief in the Real Presence, and therefore we have not spoken of his "view" on that doctrine; but we cannot but express our regret that he falls into the vulgar error of confounding it with transubstantiation, and still more that he should call the latter a heresy:—should not a D.D. understand the meaning of the word "heresy" better? We regret, too, that he should have gone out of his way to preach a sermon, which he has added as an appendix, against the doctrine of the Real Presence, (for it amounts to this, though ostensibly levelled against transubstantiation:) in which is clearly enunciated the doctrine of the real absence. This perhaps is necessary to every one, who is more anxious to be "equally remote," than to be Catholic. Had it not been for this we should feel inclined to recommend these Lectures to persons who take a very low view of the Sacrament; in such a quarter they might be of use, where higher teaching would be rejected.

The first Lecture opens with a very graceful idea:

"In the cathedral, and often in the parish church of our country, there are several stages of approach to the immediate precinct in which stands the Table of the LORD, the point of sight for all the worshippers. First, there is the choir or chancel, which, at its further end, contains this precinct. Then there is the transept, then the nave, and then, at the door of the nave, the porch of entrance. But around the building itself often lies a considerable enclosure, once used for the purpose of interment, to which access is gained by a gate, sometimes arched over, and made into a porch, and called the lych-gate, or corpse-gate, from the circumstance that the priest, in the burial-office, there meets the corpse. The Office of the Holy Communion, on the consideration of which we enter to-day, has similarly several stages of approach into its inmost sanctuary. The culminating act of the whole service is, of course, the consecration and participation of the Elements. But towards this act, there are several advances: there is the *ter sanctus*, or seraphic hymn of praise, with the prayer of access. There are the comfortable words, by which we lift ourselves up to praise, resembling the steps, by which we pass up into the choir. There is the exhortation, confession, and absolution, the more immediate preparation, which may correspond with the transept. Then comes that portion of the office at which non-communicants may be present, embracing the collect, epistle, and gospel, creed, sermon, offertory, and prayer for the Church militant; and beginning with that, which is the porch of the whole edifice, the prayer for the sovereign, or chief magistrate. What remains may be properly called the earlier preparation, corresponding to the precinct round the church, or cathedral. It consists of the Ten Commandments, the Law, which, in its condemning

power, is to real Christians, dead and buried, and cannot harm them. And to this burial-ground of the Decalogue, which solemnises the mind by its grave and stern associations, we are admitted by a little gate or porch, consisting of two short prayers."—Pp. 45, 47.

This idea, which is a further proof of how completely the symbolical pervades our ritual worship, as well as the minds of every thoughtful worshipper, is well conceived, and generally well worked out in the course of these Lectures. In doing so, it is curious to observe that is only when the ritual is fully carried out according to the intention of the Church, that the symbolical is fully apparent; Dr. Goulburn's Catholic perception led him to discern this, but his Protestant tendencies lead him to mar and spoil the conception in its execution. Thus, while he makes the Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution, correspond to the transept, he would exclude non-recipients from being present, as if the transept was not as much for the people as the nave. But a more curious anomaly follows; he would confine the whole sacrificial act to the offering up of the alms and oblations, ignoring the more solemn one of "*Do this.*" He approves of having the whole congregation present at the first oblation, but speaks very strongly against the presence of non-communicants throughout the whole office; thus he thinks that the general congregation should unitedly offer the sacrifice, and then depart, without staying to complete the action. On what grounds of common sense, or of ancient Jewish sacrificial custom, he would support this view, it is difficult to see. He says:—

"And here I must advert to an erroneous and unscriptural practice which is fast creeping into some of our churches, though it has not a particle of sanction from the Liturgy. [Will Dr. Goulburn tell us where the Liturgy sanctions the practice of non-communicants leaving the church in the middle of the office?] . . . The practice I refer to is that of being present at the actual celebration of the LORD'S Supper without communicating, and the accounting such presence as an acceptable work of devotion, though it be of an inferior grade. See how the view we have propounded fences off this mistake. The great characteristic Blessing of the Ordinance is union with CHRIST; His Body and His Blood are given in the Supper, not to be gazed upon by spectators, but to be partaken of by faithful communicants. Unless there is a participation you defeat the end of the Ordinance."—Vol. II. p. 176.

Yet he would have non-recipients actually offer the Sacrifice! The only consistent course would be to exclude them from the whole Office. Again, if the reason given be a valid one, that, "unless there be a participation, you defeat the end of the Ordinance," what shall we say of public Baptism, or Confirmation, or Ordination? for even Dr. Goulburn would not hold that the whole congregation should be baptized, or confirmed, again and again?

If he say there is a value in the united prayers of the congregation, may not we say the like in the other case? So inconsistent is Protestant theory with Catholic Ritual. Again, a careful examination of the Office will show us the Church's mind on this point. There are two Exhortations after the Prayer for the Church Militant, differing in tone as well as in rubrical notice. The first seems to be addressed to the whole congregation generally; the second to communicants only: it seems to suppose that the direction in the First Reformed Book is still the custom, viz. that the communicants "shall tarry still in the quire," and "all other (that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks," but not that they depart out of the Church. The language of the longer exhortation implies the presence of non-communicants, while that of the shorter does not suppose their exclusion. A parallel case occurs in the Baptismal Office, where the Gospel and the Exhortation following are said to the congregation generally; before the next Exhortation is the rubric, "Then shall the Priest speak unto the godfathers and godmothers in this wise;" but still in the presence of the whole congregation. Is there, in fact, any office of the Church which is not public? Even the Visitation of the Sick, except, of course, private confession and absolution, supposes others present besides the sick person and the priest. Why then should it be otherwise with the Celebration of the Great Sacrament? If this had been exceptional there would surely have been a rubric to say so.

DE BURGH'S DONNELLAN LECTURES.

1. *The Early Prophecies of a Redeemer: Six Discourses preached before the University of Dublin, at the Donnellan Lecture, 1853.*
By W. DE BURGH, D.D.
2. *The Messianic Prophecies of Isaiah, the Donnellan Lecture for 1862.* By W. DE BURGH, D.D.

THE chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, is a fit representative of the Irish Church at large. There is only a monthly celebration of the Eucharist: but there is frequent preaching, at least thrice a week. The Donnellan lecture, established by an *English* lady, after the manner of Hulse and Bampton, gives yearly a special direction to the homiletical line of thought for at least six Sundays. The volumes at present under review, are the substance of two years' lectures. The heads of the University so highly appreciated Dr. De Burgh's first year's lectures, that they re-elected him to the office for 1862.

Of the preacher, we apprehend, much is not known in England; yet he is a fruitful and successful author. In the first place, the Church owes to Dr. De Burgh one of the most valuable works of modern times, in the study of the Holy Scriptures. It was he first conceived the plan, which he partly carried into execution, of "the Englishman's Hebrew and Greek Concordance of the Holy Scriptures;" but the heavy cost of so large a work, equalling in bulk three or four volumes of Dr. Smith's valuable dictionaries, compelled Dr. De Burgh to entrust his plan to an eminent and wealthy member of the Plymouth sect, who, in this matter at all events, "spelling his prophets with an 'f,'" appropriated the name and fame, and the gains which ultimately must be very great indeed. The University for once sensible of merit so great and so obscure, honoured the originator of the plan with his degree in divinity; and although Dr. De Burgh regards, as ranking among "truths out of place the most dangerous errors," such catholic verities, as "sacrifice," "priesthood," "the separate state of the dead,"¹ he may in truth be regarded as one of the most conservative churchmen in a Church blessed with Bishops, some of whom have a conscientious objection to ordaining.

Before his present work came before the public, Dr. De Burgh was favourably known, among Apocalyptic students, as a calm and consistent futurist; one in whose wake Dr. Todd, and others more known have followed. Prophecy is a favourite theme, indeed, with the Irish divines, and those who refuse to consign to eternal reprobation their Roman Catholic fellow-Christians, controversially dispose of them pretty much to the same effect, with the uncovenanted nations in the last fiery trial. The doctrine of the Second Advent is of course Catholic. The gross accretions which patented the name, and formulated the heresy of Millenarianism, are an unhealthy subject to engage the attention and command the homage of a whole generation of Churchmen. In a recent article in this magazine, the writer contrasted the position of the Roman Catholic body in Ireland with that held by the Church.² One point of likeness is certainly to be found in the steady adherence to what may at all events be called extra-ecclesiastical dogma, and that one dogma. To ourselves nothing proves more distinctly the spiritual decadence of the Roman body, in Ireland and elsewhere, than its all-engrossing parthenolatry. Even supposing that deification of the Blessed Virgin Mary was not the mischievous tenet that it is, such exclusive devotion to one truth is emi-

¹ See the work referred to in the list of the author's publications. On "the separate state of the dead." Dr. De Burgh is quite assured that our Lord in leading captivity captive translated all the holy departed into Heaven—a view, which is not more contrary to the Greek of this, and the preceding clause, than it is contrary to the whole current of Catholic Tradition.

² Nov. 1862.

nently abnormal; like a cramp in the body natural, it betrays an undue and unhealthy action. Indeed the very vice and poison of heresy lies in its first principles, to be detected in this "being puffed up for one" doctrine, to the disparagement of others; in this magnifying and lifting up of one truth to the unintentional oversight or deliberate neglect of others. The Irish Clergy, in their unreasoning devotion to escatological speculations, which the charity of the Church has mercifully left in a very great measure undefined, avow themselves as audaciously as their Roman Catholic neighbours in favour of a development of doctrine, and blush not to affirm that the divine principles of the Creed are inadequate for the teaching and edification of the Church.

Dr. De Burgh stands quite apart from the whole herd of polemical Apocalypticists. Occasionally, indeed, we detect the partiality of the student and the author, and the enthusiasm of the imaginary monitor, as though the views advanced were important above any other; or as if they were the peculiar treasure-trove of the author. But waiving these blemishes, Dr. De Burgh's style is very individual—no very common thing in these very common days; and if we must own there is a poverty of expression, there is a singularly felicitous arrangement. The volumes, whose titles are prefixed to this paper, are properly the first and last of an escatological course, the central part of which is to be found in the author's admirable escatological exposition of the book of Psalms. The first of these volumes of lectures contains sermons on the six early prophecies of the Redeemer. We cannot help regretting that the author should have thus left uncompleted the great canon of patriarchal prophecy; and we trust he will be induced to supplement it in his first (as he has done in his second) course of lectures, when a second edition is called for, the missing lecture. He takes no notice of the great prophecy respecting the Man *JEHOVAH* given to the patriarch David (2 Sam. vii. 19); given to him who may be justly styled the last of the patriarchs. And though this prophecy may be taken up in the 89th Psalm, so far as the promise of "the seed" is concerned, the material part is not produced there, nor is ever referred to by Dr. De Burgh. By the material part of the prophecy we mean David's so to speak inspired commentary on the words of God in the verse referred to above, with which may be compared 1 Chron. xvii. 17.¹ We relegate to a note the strict version of the Hebrew, from which it will be

¹ Bishop Horsley translates well:

2 Sam. vii. 19. "And this (which was said of his house in distant times), is the arrangement about the Adam [O] LORD JEHOVAH."

1 Chron. xvii. 17. "And Thou hast regarded me in the arrangement about the Adam which is to be from above [O] LORD JEHOVAH."

Stier renders the latter clause thus:

"And hast regarded me in the manner of a man [rather The Adam] who in degree is the LORD GOD."

seen that this is the crown and *πλήρωμα* of all antecedent prophecy. In fact there is, perhaps, no prophecy in the whole compass of the Scripture, which so fully and expressly reveals the whole doctrine of the Incarnation, wherein man was made God, and God was made man; and regarded from a human point of view there is every reason that such a full prediction should have been given to and received by the last of the patriarchs: that the utterances in which the voice of the last of these "seven thunders" pealed forth should be most expressive. For David, beside the special spiritual honours bestowed on him by the love of God, was the only one in the Patriarchal dispensation, which may be said to have closed in him, who united in his own person—as Abraham had before him—the temporal and spiritual dignities, and the temporal and spiritual promises. In a work treating of "the Early Prophecies of the Redeemer," it cannot but be matter of regret that the author should have stopped short of this most full revelation and foreshowing of the verity of the Incarnation, which, in a word forms the text of all succeeding Messianic Prophecy. The previous prophecies may, indeed, be thus arranged. That to Adam and Eve contains the promise of the *Man*; that prediction of Enoch contains the promise of *God*; the expectation of Job is of God in the flesh. The next two promises, the one to Abraham of "blessing," the other given through Moses,¹ of Shiloh the new lawgiver, form one prediction of the new "Priest;" the next through Moses also of the new "Prophet;" and the last through David of the new "King."

We are not quite sure that we can adopt, if we can be said to understand the author's axiom that the burden and theme of prophecy is crisis,—and "not details." But our author seems to insist over much in his application of this axiom in affirming that the *fulfilled* prophecies of revelation are the exception. All this is a mere truism if it is anything. In no case save where there is express Scriptural authority for the statement can anyone presume to affirm that this or that prophecy has been fulfilled; as in a similar case no one can venture to state without like authority that any text of Scripture means this and only this. The Scriptures have told us of the "sufferings of CHRIST and the glory that

¹ Dr. De Burgh mentions in a note Balaam's prophecy of the Star, the revelation vouchsafed to the Gentiles corresponding to that given in the last promise to Israel: the Eternal Royalty of the Adam-LORD-JEHOVAH. In this note, p. 169, he refers to a sermon on this prophecy to be found in another of his works, in which he substantially agrees with Newton. Reckoning the prediction of Balaam, Patriarchal Prophecy completes the mystical number of seven; with an eight, expressive of completeness. How fully this characteristic is exhibited in David's prediction it is needless further to point out. In the Davidic æra the priesthood was inaugurated afresh on the death of Eli; Prophecy became an institution under Samuel; and Royalty became consecrated afresh (after the failure of Abimelech, and Saul, and Ishbosheth, elected by the people or army) in the person of the Son of Jesse.

should follow," (1 S. Pet. i. 11) ; to limit these latter words to the final consummated triumph of the SAVIOUR, to grudge all interpretation of them which would take in the present glory of the SON of GOD, at the right hand of the Majesty on High appears to us neither logical nor theological. Or again ; one is not a little startled to read as at page 16, a wholly unmodified statement to the effect that this is not the day of CHRIST's Power. Of course this is not the day—and for our own part we can only say we never heard of anyone who affirmed the contrary—of the sensible manifestation of the judicial power of the Lamb. But the whole mission of the Church is rooted in the very fact that this is the day of CHRIST's Power. "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth ; go ye therefore and teach all nations," &c. We lament all the more these and the like blemishes in an otherwise useful publication, because they betray in the author that inadequate notion of the Power and Office of the Church, which is exhibited more distinctly in the author's other publications. The very fact that the Church is able through the indwelling CHRIST to "fill up that which is behindhand of His sufferings" is itself the transcendent verification of the Power of the Son of Man on earth.

But it is time to turn to the more happy parts of Dr. De Burgh's work.

The Lecture on the Prophecy of Enoch is very interesting. After showing that the prophecy refers to the wicked of the last days, of whom the wicked of Enoch's time were but types, the author proceeds :

"From the first prophecy—we learned that this Dispensation issues in a matured development of the 'enmity' of 'the serpent and his seed' against the 'seed of the woman' by a confederation of the powers of the world under one head to anticipate and prevent the establishment of CHRIST's kingdom : which crisis of the serpent-power is the time chosen for the appearing of Him whom the same prophecy had announced 'to bruise the serpent's head.' And this same crisis we have now again here brought before us in another prophecy, which (the emblem aside) describes in plain terms the consummation of ungodliness and antichristianity at the LORD's Advent ; exemplified, moreover, by a type of that event, in which, there is ground to conclude, it received a first fulfilment. And yet, though thus advertised and warned—there is much reason to fear that the Church of our day is far from prepared for such a crisis. A day of judgment to come is, indeed, matter of universal belief, that is a general judgment of all mankind ; and, in connection with it, a second coming of CHRIST at some indefinite period. But a day of judgment as regards this dispensation, a day of visitation as regards the Church and Christendom at large, and the coming of the LORD in that aspect of it contemplated by Enoch, and in which (we have seen) it was typified by the Deluge in special judgment on the antichristian,—this is apprehended and looked for by few. And not only so, but expectations totally different are en-

tertained by the majority, and an issue of this dispensation the very opposite to that predicted: not in apostasy and consequent judgment, but in the extension and triumph of the Church, and the enlargement of the kingdom of CHRIST prematurely considered to have been already and long since established."—P. 41.

This is a favourite subject with our author: and the passage contains a distinct enunciation of the Belief of the Church. She whose portion is the cross, who is to be perfected through suffering in her likeness to her LORD, cannot possibly expect a triumph here or the *universal* diffusion of the Gospel and conversion of the nations. The whole doctrine of the Antichrist which as a great Catholic tradition underlies the faith of the Son of God is a witness of her humble acknowledgment of the nature, limits, and duration of her office. But we take exception to the particular statement that any "majority" expect a different issue to this dispensation. The faith of the three great branches of the Catholic Church is beyond a question. Equally distinct is the testimony of all the *Calvinistic* sects. But it must be admitted that there are a great many ignorant Christians; and half-Christians; a great many who think the world is surely getting better, because they would fain persuade themselves—with as little reason for their argument—that they are getting better themselves. There are also very many benevolent, large-hearted, sweet-mouthed members of the legislature—men who take up and "do" the philanthropic line of business, friends of humanity—semi-Christian communists to whose amour propre such a prospect is indispensable. Such a class may be referred to by Dr. De Burgh, but how they are to be called a majority—or which is the main point—what is the worth and weight of their testimony we are unable to ascertain.

The IVth Lecture, "the Promise to Abraham," is very admirable. But even this is marred by Dr. De Burgh's insensibility to the authority of the Tradition of the Church. It is very much to be lamented that Sherlock and a greater than Sherlock, though no Bishop, Davison, were so far deaf to the old oracles as to limit the promise of the Law to the Jewish dispensation: and to divide off from this first promise that of the Blessing to all nations and extend this alone to Christian times. We must firmly protest against these and the like of these being called our commentators, (p. 84.) Were we to name any of our modern theologians as our commentators we might particularise out of Dr. De Burgh's own work such men as Meade and Horsley immeasurably more learned theologians than the two whom he names. And against Augustine¹ we might quote Irenæus, as Dr. De Burgh quotes him; to

¹ Comp. De Civ. Dei l. xvi. 16, 18, 21. It was also Augustine's opinion that all mankind would die out before the judgment.

ay nothing of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, and the earlier hiliasts. But let us hear our author :

"1. In the first place, the possession promised is '*everlasting*.' For example, in the renewal of the promise after Lot's separation from him, (Gen. xiii. 14, 15.) And again, ch. xvii. 7, 8, (on the occasion of the changing of his name from Abram to Abraham.)

"2. Moreover, another difficulty is, that this everlasting possession is to *himself* as well as to his seed ; as in both these passages—'*Unto thee* will I give it,' '*unto thee* and to thy seed.' And that he never possessed it is certain ; as observed by S. Stephen, (Acts vii. 5,) '*He gave him no inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on, yet He promised He would give it to him for a possession,*'—his only property in it being a burial-place which he purchased, as the sacred historian is careful to record, (Gen. xxiii.) while—

"3. Again—that this '*everlasting possession*' is of the actual land into which he was called is no less distinctly stated : so precluding another very general explanation, suggested evidently by the difficulties in the way of the hypothesis of a past fulfilment, viz. that, under the type of Canaan, Heaven is the land of promise as regards Abraham and '*the seed*' joined with him in this Covenant, of which and not of the land itself, the past possession is the pledge and earnest. But, besides, that Heaven was not revealed as the destination of the faithful after death under the Old Testament the words are express, '*this land,*' '*the land which thou seest,*' '*the land wherein thou art a stranger,*' '*all the land of Canaan.*' And to place it beyond doubt, an Apostle tells us that in this consisted the faith for which Abraham and the patriarchs after him are commended,—that they lived as strangers or mere sojourners in the very land of which they were heirs by promise, (Heb. xi. 8, 9.) The only promise of the temporary possession already enjoyed being that found in Gen. xv., given, it is remarkable, to Abraham as a pledge of his own inheritance ; and so distinct in its terms, that it is strange they should have been confounded : being to his seed only,—his literal descendants of the fourth generation, (ver. 13—16,) and of the land as possessed by them, (18—21.) And accordingly not '*for ever*' or '*for an everlasting possession*' as in every promise to Abraham and his seed before mentioned.

"All the difficulty, however, is removed in this as in most other instances, if discarding our own preconceived ideas as to the purposes and dealings of God, we receive His promises just as they are written : in which view we shall, with Abraham himself, see in this promise of the land, a further development of the original revelation of Redemption, the determining to him of that first promise in another aspect or bearing of it. As already said, '*the curse would explain the blessing.*' This '*promise*' existed from the beginning. It is that '*restitution of all things* [of] which [with the same Apostle in another place] God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began.' (Acts iii. 21.) It was given in Eden, and only renewed and made definite to Abraham in the promise of Canaan ; but of Canaan as the pledge of the whole earth—the inheritance of the world ; as the type is interpreted in another very remarkable passage of S. Paul,

which tells us, moreover, that Abraham so understood it, (Rom. iv. 13.) 'For the promise that he should be the **HEIR OF THE WORLD** was not to Abraham or to his seed through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith,' (alluding particularly, it would seem, to that promise already quoted in Gen. xiii. 14, 15,) where also 'his seed' is further determined to be his seed spiritual by the *title* to the inheritance—'the righteousness of faith,' which we know was not the title under which Canaan was held by Israel.

"But there is another important inference from the promise in this view of it; for if Canaan—if 'the world'—be yet to be inherited by Abraham in the life to come, then have we incontestable proof that the covenant with him embraced yet another hope implied also in the first promise,—namely, together with the redemption of man and the redemption of the earth, the redemption of the body, or the hope of the resurrection from the dead; which though questioned of late by some who would maintain that the resurrection is an exclusively New Testament revelation, is the unanimous interpretation of this promise to Abraham both by the Jewish and primitive Christian Church."—1st Series, Lect. IV. pp. 84—90.

In an Appendix (p. 159) to this the Author quotes the following from Meade, as strongly corroborative of his argument.

"I doubt not but you have felt some scruple (as well as others) at our SAVIOUR's demonstration of *the resurrection* in the Gospels, S. Matt. xxii., S. Mark xii. GOD said to Moses in the bush, 'I am the GOD of Abraham, and the GOD of Isaac, and the GOD of Jacob; GOD is not the GOD of the dead but of the living.' *Ergo*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must one day rise from the dead. How doth this conclusion follow? Do not the spirits of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob yet live? GOD should thus be the GOD of *the living*, though their bodies should never rise again. . . . But how should this then make for the *resurrection*? Surely it doth. He that could not err said it. Let us therefore see how it may.

"I say therefore the words must be understood with supply of that they have reference unto, which is the *Covenant* that the LORD made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in respect whereof He calls Himself '*their GOD*.' This Covenant was to *give unto them and to their seed the land wherein they were strangers*. Mark it,—not to their seed or offspring *only*, but to *themselves*. To Abraham, xiii. 15, xv. 7, xvii. 8. To Isaac, xxvi. 3. To Jacob, xxxv. 12. To all three, Exod. vi. 4, 8; Deut. i. 8; xi. 21; and xxx. 20. If GOD then makes good to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob this His *Covenant* whereby He undertook to be *their GOD*, then must they needs one day live again to inherit the promised land, which hitherto they have not done. For the GOD that thus covenanted with them, covenanted not to make His promise good to them *dead* but *living*. This is the strength of the Divine argument, and irrefragable, which otherwise would not infer any such conclusion [as resurrection of the body.]

"And this to be our SAVIOUR's meaning may appear, in that the Jews at that time used from these very places, thus understood, to

infer the *resurrection* against the Sadducees out of the law. As it is to be seen expressly of two of them.

Here follow quotations from the Rabbis. There are also quotations at length to the same effect in Wetstein's Note on S. Matt. xxii. 32.

The Lecture on "The Sceptre of Judah," which, following Horsley and Warburton, our author satisfactorily proves to mean the *Theocratical Government*, will amply repay perusal. "The Expectation of Job," the third lecture, is an able vindication of that well known passage as importing the resurrection.¹ In the sixth lecture Dr. De Burgh traces out the likeness that existed between Moses and CHRIST. Each was a *Λυτρωτής*; each was a *Μεσίτης*, and Lawgiver. In not one of these respects has the promise been as yet fulfilled to Israel.

"CHRIST was indeed 'raised up,' and as 'the Deliverer,' but not to those to whom He is here promised. *The promise is to Israel*; and to them He proved, as we know, 'a stone of stumbling, and rock of offence,' upon which 'they fell and were broken:' His advent, owing to their unbelief, the day of their judgment ending in their dispersion continued to this day. But—'There shall come out of Zion the DELIVERER (Goël), and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.'

¹ Adopting the calculations of Hales and Brinkley and the conclusions of Wall, (the former may be read in Horne's Introduction, Vol. iv. p. 1, ch. iii. § 1,) Dr. De Burgh fixes the time of Job's trial at 184 years before the birth of Abraham; and regards Moses as having translated out of hieroglyphics, and written out the Book of Job as we now have it. M. Renan's version of this "expectation" was probably not published till after our author's work appeared. We wish he could have brought to bear upon it his great Hebrew scholarship. But Dr. De Burgh would have given completeness to his treatment of his subject if he had disposed, as he could readily, of Hengstenberg's arguments against the historic character of the book. In this respect Hengstenberg goes beyond Luther, who, though bringing down the authorship to the age of Solomon, asserts its historic character. Hengstenberg's arguments against the historic character of the book may be briefly stated from his work on Job, "that Job stands higher in knowledge than Abraham," therefore Abraham ought to be older than Job; and may we not add Elijah before David, who becomes unhistorical? Again: "There is in Job more than the pure monotheism of Melchizedek." To conclude because Melchizedek on one remarkable occasion blessed Abraham in the Name of the Most High God, his only knowledge was that of a pure monotheism, is very hasty and unreasonable. The King of Sodom, if he understood Abraham, had a higher intelligence. (Gen. xiv. 22.) We may well believe Melchizedek to have known the LORD, but on the vindication of his rights as "possessor of heaven and earth," to have forborne giving Him any titles not suitable to such a juncture. But, lastly, Job is the subject of a miracle bearing a simple personal reference, of which kind there is not one in the Old Testament. Here is a very gross assumption, that the miracle was *only* personal; and was the miracle, for instance, of Enoch's translation less personal than that of Job's restoration? It is refreshing at this day to read the calm solemn words of Jerome in his commentary:—"Hoc igitur clypeo ecclesia, quæ Incarnationem Unigeniti Dei veram confitetur, et resurrectionem mortuorum verissime credit futuram, se munit et protegit, et inimicos suos convincit atque debellat. Ubi sunt illi qui dicunt nos in resurrectione alia corpora habituros? audiant istum Deum ore Dei laudatum dicentem: Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit, et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum: et rursum circumdabor pelle meâ, et in carne meâ videbo Deum."

Whence also they shall be brought back by a deliverance so similar to that which Moses wrought for them, that it is termed a second Exodus, as foretold by the same prophet (xi. 10.)—an Exodus which shall so eclipse the first as to put it out of mind, as saith another Prophet, (Jer. xxiii. 5—8.) And, finally, to complete the analogy, then at this their second Exodus shall their oppressors and the opposers of their restoration (acting in concert with the common enemy of Israel and the Church, the Anti-Christ or Anti-Messiah who with the same view—the preventing of CHRIST's kingdom, shall seek to destroy and exterminate both,) be visited with those judgments, the parallels to which, in the prophetic description, are the judgments on Israel's enemies of old,—the plagues of Egypt, and the overthrow of Pharaoh."

Then, as regards His office as Mediator, the prophecy has not been fulfilled.

"For the covenant of which Moses was the mediator, stipulating a perfect obedience to the law as its condition which they could not render, was to them a 'ministration of death' and of 'condemnation,' the glory of which was intolerable, so that they could not even behold the reflection of it in the face of Moses when he returned to speak with them after receiving at the hands of GOD 'the tables of testimony;' and (as we read Exod. xxxiv. 29 to end,) 'he put a veil on his face,' thereby signifying, as the Apostle explains this symbolical transaction, (2 Cor. iv.,) 'that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished.' They could not look beyond that dispensation to one to follow, when the veil should be done away, and the glory of GOD revealed so as that it might be contemplated without fear, even 'the glory of GOD in the face of JESUS CHRIST,' as the Mediator of the New Covenant' of the 'ministration of justification' and 'life.' This we behold. 'But WE ALL,' continues the Apostle,—we behold it, and receive the reflection of it, as did Moses of the glory shown to him. *We* behold it, but Israel is still blind to it, 'for [as he had remarked above of them, v. 14, and still his words hold good,] until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament,' or 'Covenant.' Not now, owing to the character of the dispensation, for 'the veil is done away in CHRIST,' but to their unbelief, by which the veil which was on the face of Moses is, as it were, transferred to their heart, as the Apostle explains himself, 'but even to this day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart.' It shall not however always be so; 'nevertheless when it [the heart of that people] shall turn to the LORD, it [the veil] shall be taken away.'

"In other words, they too shall be brought under the 'New Covenant,' according to the original promise of it. This covenant is indeed now in force. But in the enjoyment of our privileges we overlook the people to whom the promise was made; and more, we are ready to conclude that because it has not yet been fulfilled to them, it never will, as though the failure of man could make the Word of GOD to fail."

Lastly—

"CHRIST as 'Lawgiver,' but not in the perfected likeness to Moses;

not only in that here again the promise is not yet fulfilled to Israel, He is not yet revealed to them as their 'Prophet' in this sense: but in the fulness of the office as defined by the type. He does not yet assert it, for Moses was 'Lawgiver,' not merely as the *Revealer* of the Law, but as its *Executive* also. 'Him did God send to be a *Ruler and Judge*,' as well as Teacher, (see again Acts vii. 35.) He was the founder of a kingdom. The kingdom of God is the 'Theocracy,' as it is rightly named, which he administered mediatorially; the 'Lawgiver,' holding also 'the sceptre,' as the representative of the Shiloh of the foregoing and first prophecy of this kingdom of which the Theocracy afforded a perfect 'pattern': for that it was not (as often asserted) a temporary institution, set up only for the occasion, those who have deeply studied its law will be convinced."

It is

"the very object of His reign (as Jeremiah has also told us) '*to execute judgment and justice in the earth*,' on account of which His councils and kingdom are hailed by all nations and by all creation in those numerous prophetic songs and psalms, one of which was noticed in last lecture, and which may fitly be entitled '*Songs of the Second Advent*,' so exclusively is it their subject. In a word, as the Divine purpose in Israel's election to be a 'kingdom of priests,' to diffuse the knowledge of God to the other nations of the world will then be realized, as also His purpose in the selection of their land to be (as before shown) the centre and seat of the kingdom of God upon earth, so will the divinely framed constitution under which they were originally placed, and their primitive polity, as embodied in the Law of Moses, have then its anti-type, that brightest epoch of their history when 'the Lord their God was their King,' and they received the law at His mouth; when God tabernacled with men, and earth was brought into communication with heaven. Too holy a state of things for them to sustain, and consequently of but short continuance; but which remains on record (like many other portions of Scripture history which we are in the habit of reading as narratives of the past,) as an *historical type*,—a shadow cast before of that coming age of blessedness, when the probation of man being completed, and his failure under every dispensation fully proved—by nature, under law, and under grace—God in His abounding mercy, will Himself take in hand to confirm His word. 'He will take to Him His great power to reign,' His power, now and for a long time withheld; and the last apostacy being matured, and 'the ungodly'—the Amorite and Canaanite of the type—'rooted out of the earth,' 'the righteous shall inherit it.' (Ps. xxxvii. 28, 29, &c.) 'The kingdom of God' shall 'come' and 'His will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.'"—Pp. 125—141, 1st Series.

The second series of Dr. De Burgh's work is perhaps less characteristic of the author, and less interesting. It is an endeavour—and in the main a successful endeavour—to examine in nine Lectures all the distinctively Messianic prophecies of Isaiah,—apart that is from the scattered allusions to Messiah which are to be

found everywhere in that Prophet. The first lecture is entitled, "The Last Days," on the text, Isaiah ii. 1—4. The second is entitled, "The Prophecy of Emmanuel," and embraces ch. vii. 14, as well as ix. 6, 7. The third lecture is entitled, "The Branch and Root of Jesse," and embraces the x., xi., and xii. chapters. "The SAVIOUR waited for," which forms Lecture IV., embraces the xxiv.—xxvii. chapters. Lecture V., "The Foundation Stone," expounds xxviii. 16, 17. "The Way of the LORD prepared," is on xl. 1—5. "The Man of Sorrows," the lecture on ch. liii., takes in xliii. The eighth lecture is lix. 20, "The Redeemer come to Zion." The ninth and last, "The MESSIAH," on lxi. 1—3, compares also lxiii. 1—6. It will be seen from this analysis of the contents that a very considerable part of the whole Book of Isaiah is brought under review. It may indeed be a question how far, if at all, these passages of Scripture are separable from their several contexts, and patient of exegesis in the discerpted form. We can only say that our author's labours have been successfully directed.

On "The Last Days," our author enters into an examination of that form of expression. He concludes that in the language of the Old Testament it invariably meant the days of MESSIAH; and inasmuch as it is used in the New Testament prophetically, of a time yet to be, those "days of MESSIAH," must be understood of the days of the *glory* and *kingdom*—as distinguished from the days of the *grace* and *Church* of CHRIST. The two exceptions to this rule of interpretation are found in Hebrews i.: which, however, properly should be rendered, "*in the last of these days.*"¹ The Apostle is speaking of the close of the Old Testament dispensation; and in Acts ii. 16, 17, where from the very context we learn that the speaker but *applied* the prophecy from Joel. In the judgment of our author then there remains, after this present and passing, a "Dispensation of the fulness of the Times." The error of our popular way of teaching consists in this, that this is generally represented as the "*last time*," in the sense of there remaining no after divine economy for the ordering of the affairs of God's universe. On the contrary this is but a temporary and provisional dispensation; parenthetical, and so to speak accidental. Glory,—not grace; a kingdom, and not a Church; a universe, not an election from one department of His creatures; this is what Messiah looks forward to. This is the purport of the Divine exhortation, "Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the utmost part of the earth as Thy possession." To this consummation points all that S. Paul has written of the regeneration of the creature; when in a word there will be no more curse. The dawn of this final dispensation will be ushered

¹ ἐν ἑσχατίᾳ τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων. Ebrard would have strengthened the author's view, by pointing out the true reading ἑσχατοῦ. But see his whole note.

in by the Advent and overthrow of Antichrist, and the restoration and conversion of the Jews; who, to use a favourite sentiment of our author, are *the Key to Prophecy*.

"This character of the present dispensation, and the subordination, in the revealed purposes of GOD, of the national conversion of the world to the restoration of Israel, have been treated of in the former Series of these lectures; and illustrated by reference to other parallel prophecies; to which might have been added (as there observed) all the prophecies of this latter event, in which, without an exception, the same subordination is observed. And it is therefore only necessary here to add under this head that, in this new order of things, this new Dispensation to succeed the present, we have the answer to an objection commonly urged against the literal interpretation of these prophecies—that such a prospect is inconsistent with the New Testament statements that in the Christian Church there is no national distinction.—And this is indeed true of this Dispensation which is emphatically a Dispensation of the Spirit and of Faith, in the absence of any local presence, or visible manifestation of GOD. But should such be vouchsafed, there can be no doubt that worship would be directed to the place of that manifestation. And so, in that day, when, His kingdom being come, 'all things shall fall down before Him, all nations shall worship Him:' this worship and homage (we are prepared to expect) shall be rendered to Him *there* where His glory shall be revealed—where shall be '*the place of His throne*.'—A marked distinction, which (though not having place in the Christian Church, the calling of which is altogether distinct and heavenly) will be realised in that day, when—following out the type of the Ark and its Glory—the theocracy will be revived under the form of the restored 'Kingdom of Israel;' and that people will have the pre-eminence, among the nations subject to CHRIST, assigned them in the Prophecy of Isaiah before us."—2 Ser. 15—18.

Dr. De Burgh is very earnest in calling our attention to the limits and office of the Church: which as its very name in the original implies is an *election out* of the world: not as it is generally understood an election of the world. The work of the Church is therefore not to convert the world, but to complete the election: to accomplish as CHRIST's agent and instrument the *πλήρωμα* of the Gentiles. The great work of the *national* conversion of the heathen, depends on the *national* conversion of Israel; and this again depends on the times and seasons of the LORD's Second Advent. In this connection we may quote our author's remarks on Isaiah ix. 6, 7:

"But that the fulfilment was then only primary, or rather, that here (as usual) the first and second Advents of CHRIST are brought together, and 'the feeble beginning of His kingdom is closely connected with its glorious completion,'—yea, and that the latter is the prominent object of the Prophet's vision, is evident from the sequel, which goes on to describe a scene of universal exultation which had no cor-

respondence in the time of CHRIST's first coming, 'Thou hast multiplied the nation and increased its joy; they joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest,' (the joy of victory, moreover, and of the deliverance of the nation from its oppressors,) 'and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil. For Thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor as in the day of Midian. For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise,' (or din of war,) 'and garments rolled in blood; but this will be with burning and fuel of fire.' Where there are two notes distinguishing this from all ordinary conflicts and triumphs; one the resemblance to '*the day of Midian*,' (the victory gained by Gideon, Judges vii.,) of which the special characteristic is that it was a deliverance effected, not by human means or force of arms, but miraculously by the immediate interposition of the Divine power. And what like deliverance of the people of Israel attended the first Advent? (For that Israel is concerned, and that we have not merely here 'a beautiful imagery descriptive of man's deliverance from the yoke of Satan,' must be maintained, as imperiously demanded by the context, and by consistency of exegesis.) Rather, then indeed were they effectually brought under 'the yoke' when Judæa was made a Roman province, and the 'rod of the oppressor' felt, as never before, when the same power, as the instrument of the Divine judgment, dispersed the nation and destroyed their city—a judgment never since revoked; and so, in its continuance, a decisive proof that the deliverance here is yet future. In addition to which this destruction is further stated to be *by fire*, to which the enemy, with his implements of war, 'shall be for fuel,' in contradistinction to the weapons of ordinary warfare and the blood-stained garments of the slain: the uniform characteristic of the second Advent, when CHRIST 'shall be revealed in flaming fire,' taking vengeance on the 'confederacy' seen from far in this vision, and on him who shall head it, at once the last and greatest opponent of MESSIAH's kingdom and owing to their connection with it in the Divine dispensations, Israel's most deadly enemy and oppressor who shall 'accomplish this indignation upon them.'"¹—Pp. 62—64.

The Lecture upon the "Foundation Stone," is very interesting. How he connects this with the critical events of the Consummation, may be seen from the following extract. He is speaking of the Law.

"And awful truly was the verification in their case of the judgment here threatened, in the demolishing of this tower of Jewish confidence; when their hope and boast proved to be 'a refuge of lies,' and their fancied 'hiding places' left them exposed to the Divine vengeance; when they who thought themselves alone entitled to the privileges of God's people were dispossessed, the nation scattered to the four winds, and their city and temple laid in ruins. But while the destruction of Jerusalem, in consequence of the Jews' rejection of MESSIAH, thus revealed as the Foundation Stone of God's selection, was undoubtedly a

¹ We are happy to find our author supported in the main by Lowth in his note veræ 5, where the substance of the above extract may be found. . .

fulfilment of the devastation by the storm of the Divine wrath, 'the overflowing scourge,' as it is designated in the context preceding and following (v. 15 and 18); there is in that context an intimation of somewhat more in the view of the Prophet than ordinary unbelief such as was Israel's; or the visitation, awful though it was, with which it was in their instance judged. The language of 'the scornful men,' (v. 15,) 'Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through it shall not come unto us,' though applicable in degree to the self-confidence and false security of every unbeliever, resting on his own foundation, and taking shelter in the refuge of his own erection, expresses rather the defiance and open-mouthed challenge of 'the scoffers' foretold to come 'in the last days,' (2 S. Pet. iii.) who fortify themselves against the fiery judgment of the great day of the LORD, saying, 'Where is the promise of His coming?' and ignoring its great type, the destruction of a world formerly by water. Such a boast is of the disciples of him who, we are told, will be in league with Satan, to whom 'the dragon gives his power, and his throne, and great authority,' and whose followers may therefore indeed think 'that they have made a covenant with death and with hell are at agreement.' While of them it may be emphatically said that they 'have made lies their refuge,' to whom GOD, in judicial retribution for their not believing the truth, 'shall send a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie,' the great lie of Satan, 'the man of sin,' and 'wicked one,'—a delusion of which many of the Jews of that day will be the first victims."—Pp. 151—153.

Of the great Prophecy, "Comfort ye, comfort ye My people," he says it is

"An announcement as to which there is a very general consent of commentators to refer it primarily to the return from Babylon; with a spiritual application to the redemption of the Christian Church. Of this latter view—which takes 'Jerusalem' to be a figurative designation of the Gentile Church¹—it is unnecessary to speak, as it is too evidently a mere accommodation of the words never contemplated in the prophecy. But as to the former, it is (as has been truly observed) 'a fatal objection that the Prophet is thus made to foretel Jerusalem's humiliation as 'accomplished,' and 'her sin pardoned,' whilst her greatest humiliation and most prolonged affliction had yet to take place, and her greatest sin to be committed. It would indeed be impossible for language to convey fuller consolation or more perfect reconciliation and forgiveness. 'For she hath received at the LORD's hand double for all her sins.' Not double the punishment deserved, which were incompatible with the Divine justice, and still more with the Love of GOD, whose judgment ever remembers mercy.—'Twofold punishment' in the sense, namely, suggested by the learned Houbigant, whose comment here is peculiarly worthy of note: 'The calamities incident to war (he says) are here primarily intended, in which the Jews suffered *double*

¹ May we not add that in this case we should have read Zion instead of Jerusalem? Dr. De Burgh—it may be noted here—takes no notice of the different uses and import of these terms.

punishment. Which two punishments are the *two captivities*, one under the Assyrians, the other under the Romans.' 'Those interpreters,' he adds, 'who suppose this spoken of the one return from the Babylonish captivity, are at a loss to explain how, on the Jews' return from Babylon, 'their warfare was accomplished.' For, how many and great calamities did they experience afterwards, whether by Antiochus' oppression of them, or their subjection to the Roman yoke: neither could it be said of the Jews, when they had returned from Babylon, that 'their iniquity was expiated,' since GOD was about to inflict further punishments and judgments on them by the Romans."—Pp. 161—164.

In the last lecture, "the Redeemer come to Zion," (Isa. lix. 20,) our author quotes at length from Dr. Henderson, who generally expounding in a figurative sense the language of Isaiah, when he comes to this prophecy finds himself constrained to recognise the doctrine of a millennium, and a re-establishment of Israel in the promised land.

"Nothing need be added," our author proceeds, "to the Summary" of this chapter, quoted from Dr. Henderson, as

"an exposition of the scope of this prophecy. Suffice it to say,—reverting to the remark made as to its importance in determining the interpretation of the Messianic prophecies of Isaiah in general,—that by its internal evidence, combined with the Apostolic quotation, it is demonstrated beyond question to refer to the future of the literal Zion, and to belong to the times of the Second Advent. But, this point established in this instance, it is established once for all; that 'Zion' in the other prophecies relating to it, (all of them parallel in some part to this) means Zion; that Israel's restoration is literal, not spiritual only; as is also the kingdom of MESSIAH which is inseparably identified with both. It is easy indeed to say, with the Bible closed, that all this is imagery, that the prophets set forth the spiritual things of the Christian Church and this Dispensation in language borrowed from the Jewish history and polity, and by symbols taken from the redemption from Egypt, the Theocracy, or the then existing state of things. But with the Bible open, and prophecies—such as this and Ch. xi.—weighed verse by verse, and clause by clause, as well as read in context, such an interpretation cannot be for a moment maintained with a semblance of consistency, or any regard to the integrity of the inspired text, which might thus be made to say anything or nothing.

"It must indeed be allowed by these expositors that, it would be very desirable to maintain a more literal and real matter-of-fact exposition; that so the 'Thus saith the LORD' of the prophets, should be regarded with more veneration, and the Word so enounced be held more sacred and inviolable; 'Not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the Word of GOD.' But, in addition to the objection from the distinction between Jew and Gentile, as inconsistent with Christianity already noticed; it is assumed by them that this cannot be done without a result derogatory to the Christian's spirituality of mind and heavenly affection, a re-

trograde tendency to a lower standard, in the substitution of temporal prosperity and happiness, such as characterised the covenant of Israel of old and as occupy this chapter, for 'the better promises' of the New Testament, and of earthly for heavenly blessings; and this apprehension it is evidently that with the greater part weighs against the literal sense. This, however is another of the misconceptions arising from holding the finality of this dispensation, and confounding the present state and calling of the Church, with the kingdom of CHRIST to follow. The truth is, that so far from the Church and this dispensation being (as thus assumed) the theme of prophecy, both were a 'mystery' (as the Apostle Paul has taught us). Both are owing to the rejection of CHRIST by the Jewish nation, also very obscurely intimated by the Prophets of old, in consequence of which the kingdom of the MESSIAH foretold by them was deferred; and His coming seen by them, as one divided between two appearances; the interval, the period of Israel's blindness and MESSIAH's absence, being (so to speak) a parenthesis filled up by the Church; an election as before said, and, as with a special calling, so with special hopes.

"Of these hopes, accordingly, this and the like prophecies do not speak. It is not that they adumbrate them under the guise of earthly blessing, but they do not reveal them at all. They are distinctly heavenly. The promise to the Church is 'to reign with CHRIST' at His coming, in reward for 'suffering with Him now,' and to be 'glorified with Him.' But as the Apostle says, speaking of the resurrection body, 'the body proper to the spirit,' in contradistinction to the 'natural body' or 'body proper to the soul,' so of the kingdom it will unite the celestial and terrestrial glories. The 'celestial' belonging to CHRIST and those who reign with Him, who will occupy those 'heavenly places' in which are now enthroned those 'evil spirits' who with the 'Prince of the power of the air' are 'the rulers of the darkness of this age;' and the terrestrial belonging to the nations over whom they reign, among whom the restored Israel will be pre-eminent. And the latter, the 'terrestrial glory' or the kingdom in its terrestrial aspect is the main theme of Prophecy, because in it is fulfilled the purpose of redemption as regards the World and the earth, by which its destiny and the end of its creation are answered.

"The end of its creation: because (as shown in a former lecture,) it must be inferred that the work of GOD, pronounced to be 'very good,' that is, perfectly adapted to its end, but which so soon as made, became 'subject to vanity' by reason of sin, should not remain so for ever, and thus never answer its end. It was additionally the inference from the promise of Redemption, which word implies the hope of restitution, but the creation of a 'new Heaven and a new Earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.' And it became a definitively revealed purpose by the selection of the Land of Promise as the type of a renewed Earth and redeemed World. To object then to this reign of the Saints on earth, as holding out a carnal prospect, is to confound things that differ, the difference, namely, between the bearings of the second Advent Kingdom on those who come with CHRIST, and the nations subsequently gathered unto Him; between those who reign and those over whom they reign; between the *Kings* and *subjects* of the dispensation.

The former title belongs to the elect Church, the Saints,—to whose state nothing carnal can belong, even though such intercourse should exist between them and mortal man, as ministers of blessing to them as once between men and angels sent to them on like errands. While the state of the nations of the earth in that day, subject to this happy rule, will be indeed carnal in one sense, in so far as they will be in the flesh, or in the condition of mortal humanity, such as is now the life of man on the earth, only with such accession of blessing physical and moral, as the present power of a present LORD, in its full exercise must bring to the whole creation ;—to whose mortal eyes the glory of the raised, changed, and transfigured saints reigning with CHRIST, as well as His glory, may be manifested, and with the same consciousness of blessing (to advert again to the type) as it was to the disciples admitted to witness the earnest of it on Mount Tabor ; or as was the glory of the LORD to Israel of old under the Theocracy.”—Pp. 225—231.

But we must close. Without committing ourselves to an approval of all the author's theories, we can heartily commend these Lectures as creditable to the author, and to the Irish Church, and as recalling to mind some too much neglected lines of Catholic tradition.

HARVEST CELEBRATIONS.

Thanksgiving for Harvest. A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Blessings of Harvest, to be used when it shall be allowed by the Ordinary. Revised and agreed on, by both Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, February 14, 1862. To which are added some Hymns for Harvest. London: Rivingtons. 1863.

THE annual harvest-thanksgiving festival, in one form or another, bids fair to become one of our permanent institutions. In its best form, we certainly consider it to be a very decided improvement on the coarse licence and ungodly revelry of the old-fashioned harvest-home supper. Its best form is, in our opinion, that of the six or eight farmers, together with the squire and clergyman, of a moderately-sized country parish, agreeing to give their labourers a *common*, instead of a separate, meal, preceded by a special Service at the Church, and followed by "rustic sports," and a tea-fight for the old folks and juveniles of the village, who, though gleaners on their own account, have not been reckoned in the number of farm servants. We may as well state at once summarily our reasons for this preference. We consider then the *parochial* to be the best form of harvest festival (1) because it is parochial; it falls in harmoniously with the parochial system, and tends to foster a parochial *esprit du corps*. It stands to the village in the same relation as the Olympic games to the ancient Greek,—the Eisteddfod, of which we have lately heard so much, to the Welsh, nationality. It brings into play and strengthens the ties of parish brotherhood, and quickens the sense of kindly interdependence among fellow-parishioners of different grades and callings. The Parish Church, the Parish Priest, the Squire, the Farmers of the parish, are so many centres about which the festival naturally gathers, and so preserves its unity and symmetry in the common parochial idea.

2. Then again, the parochial organization ready made to hand provides at once for the necessary outlay of trouble and expense. Each farmer will be willing enough to contribute his proportionate share of the eatables and drinkables, or an equivalent in money, according to the number of his labourers at so much per head. Others of the more needy and deserving of the parishioners might be fairly helped to buy a ticket of admission to the feast, either from the Church offertory fund, or by special subscriptions collected for the purpose from the well-to-do inhabitants. A field for the amusements, and rickcloths for the tent, would no doubt readily be furnished from one or other of the farms; and division

of labour in the way of cooking, serving, decorations, &c., be cheerfully accorded by the female members of the farmers' and other tradesmen's families; though, as regards the first item, the engagement of some one responsible contractor to cater for the whole party has, we believe, been found to be the most convenient and economical plan.

3. Lastly, what certainly is not the least advantage in the matter of a religious festival, and such of course a harvest thanksgiving is supposed to be, the same parochial organization, the presence of the clergy, the squire, the farmers of the parish, each of the latter being considered chargeable with the good conduct of his own labourers, is the best possible security for the morals and behaviour of the rest of the company. Experience unhappily has proved that such a precaution is not by any means superfluous on these occasions. We needed not the evidence of "*Ploughing and Sowing*" to inform us, that farm-servants as a class are not specially religious, nor exempt from the prevailing vices of a rural population. Each village Arcadia has its satyrs, "lewd fellows of the baser sort," lying in wait to trip up the unwary nymph, and to turn the most innocent amusements and manly sports into an occasion of lasciviousness and insobriety. Our country wakes and revels afford sufficient proof how a Christian holiday may in course of time degenerate into the unrestrained excesses of a bacchanalian orgy. As a matter of fact, indeed, we have been told lately by a correspondent in the *Guardian* of the very serious abuses incidental to these festivals, in the way of scandalous immoralities, which he alleges to have been actually occasioned by the crowd, over-excitement, and unrestraint afforded by the monster-mass-meeting in one notorious instance, described by him as a kind of rural Cremorne. We ourselves, in the course of the present autumn, were eye-witnesses of a somewhat similar harvest gathering to the number of some twelve or thirteen hundred people from the farms of four contiguous but separate parishes. The mistake in these cases is the *over-crowding*, and the consequent impossibility of a proper control. The people brought together are unconnected with the local clergy, and are mostly strangers to each other; and thus the parochial *family-feeling*, which we consider one of the healthiest features of the festival, is altogether marred. There is the further objection of over-burdensomeness in the way of trouble and expense. Year after year recurring, as the freshness and novelty fades away, these festivals are almost sure to become tiresome and a bore, and to break down through their own unwieldy weight, when too much effort is required to sustain them. In most such cases, moreover, they are far too dependant on the open purse and accidental personal taste of individuals to give much promise of becoming permanent institutions. Worst of all, it is not by any means easy to preserve the

religious idea proper to a feast of Christian joy and thanksgiving, amidst the throng and turmoil and jostle of a bear-garden.

Such as these, then, appear to us good and sufficient reasons for preferring the parochial form of Harvest Festival. Even in the case of large and straggling parishes, comprising distant outlying hamlets, we consider that each *quasi* village should have its own separate feast. But we must confess, for our own part, that however wisely and successfully administered these festivals may be, we are not so sanguine as some of our contemporaries, of any very important good resulting from them. The practical good they are likely to effect, is of a negative kind, and rather social and political, than religious. Properly conducted, they supply a check upon the excesses of the private Harvest Home, of which they are the substitute. They bring country neighbours together in a friendly way, and may break down some of the stiff reserve and antipathy which often separates families on social, political, or religious grounds. A speech, attributed to Mr. Disraeli, at a recent rural festival, pretty well exhausts all the benefits which may be expected from them. "You have to-day," he is reported to have said, "wisely and properly expressed to the Giver of all good things, your sense of these blessings. You are now assembled under this tent, to express feelings of a different kind, but which in their order are equally becoming to you. These meetings, somewhat new in our manners in this country, are calculated, I think, to produce very great advantages; and one of the principal benefits which they do bring about, is, that they cause all classes in the agricultural world, to mix and meet together. Here the landlord, the farmer, and the cultivator of the soil—the British labourer—meet, bound together by a sympathy of feeling, and all equally rejoicing in the honourable and honest fulfilment of their labours for the year."¹ But we do not see that any very important *religious* results can reasonably be expected. In the first place, it must not be forgotten, that a Harvest Thanksgiving, after all, is at most an act only of natural religion; and though, of course, we are far from disparaging natural religion as the basis of a higher faith, and allow that the witness of God in sending fruitful seasons, may reach semi-heathen hearts, insensible to more direct Christian teaching; yet nature at best is not the Gospel, and a preparative rather than an instrument of conversion.

While then, for reasons stated, we most cordially assent to the principle of a Harvest celebration, and that as a permanent anniversary, we do not wish to see it placed by authority, on the same footing as one of the Church's proper Christian festivals, and dignified with a proper form of service, incorporated in the Prayer Book. The Church has her special seasons, the Rogation Days,

¹ From the *John Bull*, September 19, 1863; Report of Harvest Home at Rayners, near Penn, Bucks.

for invoking God's blessing on the fruits of the earth, and thanking Him for the same; but it is significant, that no proper Office for this purpose, has been appointed by authority, as if a matter rather suggesting private intercession,¹ and sufficiently met by using with a special intention, the ordinary forms. A special anthem (*e. g.*, "Thou visitest the earth, and blessest it, and makest it very plenteous,") or at Evensong, a grand *Te Deum* in the place of the Anthem, would quite sufficiently specialize the service, without any need of legislative interference. What we ourselves, perhaps, should recommend as a preferable method of observance, would be the regular Morning and Evening Offices to be said or sung as usual, at the usual hour; and at some convenient time, a short *extra* special service, consisting of a hymn and sermon, followed by an Offertory, and another hymn, *Te Deum*, or *Benedicite*, ending with the priestly benediction. Such a use of the *Benedicite* at least, or of certain appropriate psalms, would come within the letter of the law, (on the principle pointed out in a former article of the *Eccelesiastic*,²) as the whole service would be, we consider, in accordance with its spirit. There was certainly no apparent necessity for Convocation to prepare a form of thanksgiving for Harvest, any more than for other occasional commemorations, such as a Church Dedication Feast, or a Missionary Service, which are of a more directly Christian, not to say Ecclesiastical, character. We are aware of no better grounds for it, than the bad precedent of the American Prayer Book. And we think it unfortunate, that the only two abortive attempts at legislation,³ essayed by Convocation, since its revival, should have resulted in measures so un-Catholic, that the failure to carry out its enactments, is thankfully acquiesced in by, we believe, most thoughtful and well-instructed Churchmen. Judging from the particular Office now before us, we are of opinion, that ritual is not its forte. In saying so, we mean no disparagement to the theological learning and orthodoxy of members of Convocation; only their genius and literary ability do not seem exactly to lie in the direction of framing offices. *Non omnes omnia possunt*. Churchmen say just the same thing of the late excellent and most deservedly respected Bishop of London, that, much as they admire and lament his memory, his prayers are not such as they would wish to see embodied in the Prayer Book. Their fault, and the fault of the "Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving for the Blessings of Harvest," is per-

¹ There are suitable forms in Bishop Cosin's Devotions and Nelson's Fasts and Festivals.

² *Eccelesiastic*, No. LXXVIII. (O. S. CLXII.) June 1859, on Section 7 of Edward VI.'s first Act of Uniformity. "Provided also, that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, or other places, to use openly, any psalms or prayer taken out of the Bible, at any due time, not letting or omitting the service, or any part thereof, mentioned in the said book;" confirmed by section 6 of Edward's Second Act.

³ We refer also to the new Canon relative to Sponsors.

haps the common fault of almost every liturgical attempt in our Communion, since the Reformation. There is an unnatural strain after Scripture illustration. Our modern prayers are a very patch-work of Scripture texts: take the Collects for instance of the Prayer Book—*e. g.*, the first four Collects for the Sundays in Advent, and it can be proved at a glance by this simple test, which is, and which is not of ancient or mediæval date. The four State Services, happily of late abolished from their usurped place in the Prayer Book, are alike amenable to this complaint. They seem to have been taken for a model in the composition of the Convocation Harvest Service. We may quote for instance, in proof of the assertion, the very first Collect: "O Almighty and Everlasting God, Who hast given unto us the fruits of the earth in their season; Grant us grace to use the same to Thy glory, the relief of those that need, and our own comfort, through JESUS CHRIST." So far nothing could be more excellent, and according to ancient pattern, but the Collect does not end here, it goes on, "Who is the living Bread which cometh down from Heaven and giveth life unto the world," &c. Here evidently *preaching*, not prayer, the edification of the subject, not the adoration of the Object, is the prevalent idea. The other prayers and collects, are still more open to this objection. In one occurs the text, "while the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest shall not fail." Also, "Teach us, we beseech Thee, that it is not by bread alone that man doth live, and grant us evermore to feed on Him who is the true bread which cometh down from heaven." In another, "Whose dearly beloved Son did send His Apostles into all the world, to preach the Gospel to every creature—look upon the fields now white unto harvest—send forth more labourers into Thy harvest, to gather fruit unto life eternal." In another, "We beseech Thee that our mortal bodies, having been sown in weakness, may be raised in power, through the merits and mediation of Him Who is the First-fruits of them that slept." In the last, more than all, "O LORD God of Hosts, who dwellest in the high and holy place, and yet hast respect unto the lowly; who makest Thy sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendest rain on the just and on the unjust; Who by Thy mighty power dost order all things in heaven and earth; visiting the earth and blessing it, and crowning the year with Thy goodness—filling our hearts with food and gladness—so plant us here in the house of the LORD, that we may flourish everlastingly in the courts of the house of our God." All this, in our opinion, is not only in exceeding bad taste, and very like what is commonly called "cant," but extremely affected and unreal in addressing God; while the metaphorical lessons drawn from the Harvest, of Missionary work and the resurrection, however apposite in a sermon on the occasion, are altogether out of place in an Act of Thanksgiving.

One is irresistibly reminded by this ingenious dovetailing and mosaic-work of every possible allusive text that can be brought to bear upon the subject, of Sancho Panza saying the same thing over and over again in a string of kindred proverbs. How different from the few pregnant words, and single sentence, of the ancient collects! Take for an example that for the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, which suitably enough has been admitted into this office. Or one or two others, bearing upon thankfulness, from Mr. Bright's admirable collection: "O God, Who chastisest us in Thy love, and refreshest us amid Thy chastening; grant that we may ever be able to give Thee thanks for both; through JESUS CHRIST our LORD." "We beseech Thee, Almighty God, that the prosperity bestowed upon us may not lead us to be ashamed of Thy worship, but rather may always enkindle us to render heartier thanks to Thee; through JESUS CHRIST our LORD."¹ We most earnestly implore our Bishops, Dignitaries, and Proctors of Convocation, to enter upon a course of study in this school of ancient ritual, before venturing a second time to try their "prentice hand" either in amending or adding to the offices of our present Prayer Book.

¹ "Ancient Collects, &c." By Rev. W. Bright, M.A. Second edition, p. 90.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Hymns of Love and Praise for the Church's Year. By J. S. B. MONSELL, LL.D., Vicar of Egham. Bell and Daldy.

HERE we have another attempt at original hymn-writing, which is far from being as successful as that of Dr. Wordsworth. We miss, indeed, everything like power or learning; and we doubt if any one of the hymns—though none are altogether bad—will ever find a place in our Church hymnals. Decidedly the best in the book—the doctrine of which is also happily quite correct—is the Hymn on Confirmation, which we gladly quote:

“ Around the youthful soldiers
Of CHRIST, our SAVIOUR King,
Throng we with glad rejoicings
And as we joy we sing;
Praise to the GOD Who loves them,
The CHRIST, Whose Cross they bore,
The SPIRIT that now moves them,
And seals them evermore!

“ The flower of the army
Of CHRIST is kneeling now
Before His sacred altar,
His Cross on every brow;
That Cross, whose dew baptismal
First mark'd them with His love,
Now waiting the renewal
Of the descending Dove.

“ Praise to the GOD Whose mercy
First placed that symbol there,
And then through years of childhood
Preserved it fresh and fair;
To Him, Whose love confirmeth
The sign of grace to-day,
Nor lets the dew of morning
In noontide fade away.

“ Clothed in GOD's royal armour
The youthful warriors stand,
Round every breast a buckler,
A sword in every hand;
On every brow a helmet,
Salvation's hope divine;
Back from their jewell'd morions
The beams of morning shine.

“ GOD shield them in their beauty,
And keep them in their place,
And gird their loins with duty,
And fill their hearts with grace:

GOD give them a deliv'rance
 From all their ghostly foes,
 And, when life's toil is over,
 Rest where His Saints repose.

"Then round the youthful soldiers
 Of CHRIST, our SAVIOUR King,
 Let us with glad rejoicings
 This happy morning sing :
 Praise to the GOD Who loves them,
 To CHRIST, Whose Cross they bore,
 The SPIRIT, that now moves them,
 And seals them evermore!"—P. 201—203.

The Secretary of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, has published a *Week of Short Prayers*, (Hayes,) for the use of members.

The Rev. C. HOLME has published a small volume of *Annotations on the Gospel of S. Mark*. (London : Longman.)

The first Part of *The Primer*, that was put out in Henry the Eighth's reign, has just been published by Mr. Masters. The editing seems very carefully done.

Messrs. Lambert and Co. are bringing out a series of *Hymns, Sacred Part Songs, and other pieces*, which are likely to prove a most useful addition to our Church music ; they have been contributed chiefly by living composers, foreign and English, and several of the most attractive are by the editor, Mr. WESTLAKE. They are for the most part very simple, but the harmony is so good, that they must please even a taste scientifically trained. They are arranged for one or more voices, with accompaniment for organ or pianoforte. Two parts only have been published, but we trust the series will be continued, as it is precisely what is required for the musical associations which are now so happily existing in connection with the Church in many towns and villages.

Holiday Tales, (Masters,) is greatly superior to the generality of such books for little children. A really astonishing amount of sound Church teaching is conveyed in these childish stories.

DIXON'S FASTI EBORACENSES.

Fasti Eboracenses. Lives of the Archbishops of York. By the Rev. W. H. DIXON, M.A., Canon Residentiary of York, &c.; Edited and Enlarged by the Rev. JAMES RAINE, M.A., Secretary to the Surtees Society. Vol. I. London: Longman.

It was our duty not long ago to point out some defects, which in our opinion greatly decreased the value of the Dean of Chichester's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. As a biographer Dr. Hook has failed through want of sympathy with the subjects of his memoirs, and his deficiencies as an historian result from an incapacity of understanding the spirit and the manners of the times of which he wrote. His was a nineteenth century point of view, and therefore he expected to find all the mediæval Primates nineteenth century archbishops. All deviation from this standard was a fault in Dr. Hook's eyes, and, therefore, it is not surprising that his "*Lives of the Archbishops*" is a very disappointing book. We have a very great respect for Dr. Hook; he has been a hard worker in his time, and is possessed of a versatility of genius, which enables him to turn his hand to any work. He had well earned the *otium cum dignitate* which the Deanery of Chichester has brought him after a long day of toil and labour, and we would be the last to blame him for employing hours of leisure, to which in earlier days he had been unaccustomed, in writing the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. It was doubtless a pleasant amusement for the Dean, and would have been harmless to the public, but for the awkward fact that, when grave matters are lightly handled, truth must always suffer.

Some of our readers will, perhaps, demur to our unwilling censure, and of such we would ask the reason why, when the lives of the southern primates proved a pleasant employment for the leisure hours of an elderly dean, the collection of the *Fasti Eboracenses* should be the product of hard labour continued through two successive generations. Either the Archbishops of York must have been very different men from those of Canterbury, or else the *Fasti Eboracenses* must be a much more careful and solid work than the *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. A comparison of the two books will leave no ground for hesitation between the two alternatives; and therefore we welcome Mr. Raine's work, not only for its own value, but as a pattern by which, we trust, future diocesan historians will be encouraged to work.

Mr. Raine, the Secretary of the Surtees Society, with a singular and unaffected modesty, styles himself the Editor, when the whole of the first volume is the product of his authorship. The late

VOL. XXV.—NOVEMBER, 1863.

3 s

Canon Dixon was occupied for many years in collecting materials for the work, and the result of his labours will appear in a succeeding volume. His first essay in antiquarian lore was to draw up a catalogue of the members of the cathedral of York from the Great Rebellion to the present time, but at the suggestion of the late Archdeacon Todd, he was induced to extend his researches into a remoter age, and to attempt the biographies of the worthies of the Minster from the very earliest times, placing at the head of each century some notice of the general history of the Church during that period. His labours were however interrupted by his death, which occurred in January, 1854, when his widow, by the advice of Canon Harcourt and the late Dr. Raine, placed his work in the hands of the present Editor. Ten years of incessant labour have been spent in the elaboration of the crude materials, which he thus received, into the *Fasti Eboracenses* of which the first volume is now presented to the public. When the second volume appears we shall be better able to judge of the share which Canon Dixon had in the work, but of this first instalment, at least, Mr. Raine must be esteemed the real author, since not only has it been entirely written by him, but the collection of nineteen-twentieths of the materials has been the work of his industry. The position which the *Fasti Eboracenses* is intended to occupy is well expressed in the following words,—

"This book professes to be nothing more than biography. It is not the history of the English Church or of any part of it. It has nothing to do with what are called the '*times*' of the Archbishops or any of them,—that vague and unsatisfactory term, which is almost invariably the title of a bad book. It has simply to do with the men themselves with whom the book professes to deal, and collateral information is brought in only with the intention of setting off their character and history. This book is addressed *ad clerum* rather than *ad populum*, to the bees and not to the butterflies. It is written to bring out truth, and not to please fancy or prejudice, or merely to attract the popular eye. Too many sacrifices have been made to these already, and scholars who are worthy of better things, have been frightened by the bugbear of popularity. Popularity must have its due weight in the mind of every one, reader or student, but it must not be everything. If this is to be a book of reference—and it can scarcely expect to rise to that dignity—why should it be made a bad one, merely to gratify the taste which shrinks from dry details? This is an inquiring age, and what it wants are new facts, from which new conclusions may be drawn."—Preface, p. xvii.

We think that Mr. Raine has underrated the importance of his own work, a fault not very common amongst authors, for we believe that the *Fasti Eboracenses* will maintain both a permanent and a prominent position amongst the ecclesiastical literature of our country. Viewed in the light of *mémoires pour servir à l'histoire*

the Lives of the Archbishops of York will be of value to the learned, whilst from the general reader we anticipate a no less grateful acceptance; for the archbishops of old were not the mere warrior prelates, the politicians and the sportsmen we are apt to fancy them, but they ruled their dioceses with a vigour and paternal care which the energy of the present day would fail to put to shame. Some, too, were very saintly men, and since He, Who is the fountain of sanctity, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, the lives of His people must be of equal interest in every age. All, at least, were men of the same flesh and blood as ourselves, and as such, with genial sympathies and many a poetic touch, Mr. Raine has delineated the lives of some who, from the position which they held, were amongst the most eminent of their day. Nor does the author's unaffected loyalty to the Church of York in any degree diminish the value of his history. In the controversies between Canterbury and York, it is the first time perhaps that the York side of the question has been stated so fully and so well, but this appears to be always done with fairness, and due allowance made for the conscientious pertinacity with which the archbishops of the southern province maintained what they supposed to be the hereditary rights of their see.

Although Mr. Raine commences *ab initio*, he does not indulge in any theories respecting the origin of British Christianity. He deals with what is certain, and is content to leave remote traditions in the obscurity in which antiquity has veiled them. So too with York. It may have been a royal city for twelve centuries before the Christian era, but since its glories date from the time of the Roman occupation, its earlier history would be a question of little importance. At any rate the Eburacum which the Romans found would be nothing else than a collection of dirty hovels crowded together within an enclosure with a population of half naked and dirty barbarians, living amongst their flocks and herds; but the city which the Romans left was grand and stately, the emporium of the north, and the imperial residence. It was here that every emperor who visited our isle resided, and Severus and Constantius Chlorus died. Whether it be true or no that Helena was a British lady, and that Constantine was born at York, it is nevertheless certain that the first Christian emperor here assumed the purple. Whatever progress Christianity made during the time of the emperors, they seem to have been more tolerant towards its professors than in Italy and Gaul. The storm of persecution which swept over the Continent, abated before it had reached our shores, and either because the emperors were not sufficiently strong in their position, or because the Church was too weak to arouse their fears, the British Christians were unmolested. There are traditions of Bishops being settled at York from the time of Eleutherius, but nothing is distinctly known respecting them. The name of Eborius,

Bishop of Eburacum, occurs amongst those present at the Council of Arles, which is a certain proof that York was an episcopal see as early as A.D. 314. We know that York, London, and Caerleon-on-Usk were the three British Metropolitan sees, therefore in antiquity at least, Canterbury must yield the palm to York.

The real history of the Archbishops of York commences with Paulinus, whose integrity of purpose we had occasion to vindicate against Dr. Hook in a former article to which reference has been already made, and it is a satisfaction to find that Mr. Raine agrees with us in our estimate of Paulinus's conduct towards Edwin. When Paulinus came to England in A.D. 601, at the bidding of Gregory, he brought with him a letter to Augustine, in which the Pope announced his desire that York should be a metropolitan see with twelve bishops under its jurisdiction.

“ ‘We will have you send to the city of York,’ wrote Gregory, ‘such a bishop as you shall think fit to ordain, yet so that if that city with the places adjoining shall receive the word of God, that Bishop shall also ordain twelve Bishops, and enjoy the honour of a Metropolitan, for we design, if we live, by the favour of God, to bestow on him also the pall; and yet we will have him to be subservient to your authority; but after your decease he shall so preside over the Bishops, whom he shall ordain, as in no way to be subject to the Bishop of London. But for the future let this distinction be between the Bishops of the cities of London and York, let him have the precedence who was first ordained.’ ”
—Bede, i. c. 29.

In the course of the subsequent disputes, which took place between Canterbury and York, it must be borne in mind that Gregory intended Augustine's paramount authority to last only during his life, and not to be handed on to his successors, and also that he designed that metropolitan sees should be established at London and York. It follows, therefore, that Canterbury, being substituted for London, could only obtain the privileges which were intended for London.

The accomplishment of Gregory's design was postponed by the flight of Paulinus from Northumbria. The archbishop, who, as such, had received the pall from Honorius, having accepted the see of Rochester, subsided into a suffragan to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The submission of S. Chadd to Archbishop Theodore cannot be cited as a precedent, because Theodore, whether he possessed a special legatine authority, or merely assumed such a power as legates only exercised, certainly carried on his visitations with an authority to which none of his successors have laid claim. The singular modesty of S. Chadd might lead him, in the sense of his own unworthiness, to lose sight of the honour which was due to his see. The previous election of Wilfrid rendered the validity of his appointment at least doubtful. It had only been in obe-

dience to the command of King Oswy that Chadd had left his cell at Lastingham for the Episcopal chair at York, and perhaps he was glad of an excuse to retire into a sphere more congenial to his meek and placid temperament. Chadd had never received the pall, and therefore, not being a metropolitan himself, there was less difficulty in the way of his recognising Theodore in that capacity. After Paulinus fled into Kent more than a hundred years elapsed before another Bishop of York sought and obtained the pall. During this time the project of Gregory I. lay dormant until in A.D. 735 the pall was granted by Gregory III. to Archbishop Egbert. This interruption was made in after years a strong argument in favour of the precedence of Canterbury during the controversies which raged between the two metropolitan sees. The words of Gregory I. seem however to have provided for a postponement of his design. The Bishops of York were to become metropolitans when the Northumbrians were converted. With Paulinus Christianity fell for a season, and after its restoration there was a delay in the establishment of the metropolitan authority; but this delay, we think, could not be rightly held to invalidate the decree of Gregory I.; and indeed for more than three hundred years after the pall had been delivered to Egbert, no controversy arose respecting the rights of Canterbury.

In A.D. 1070, Thomas of Bayeux was appointed to the see of York. There was not at this time a sufficient number of northern suffragans to consecrate the new archbishop, and therefore Thomas had to wait until Lanfranc was raised to the see of Canterbury some months afterwards. Lanfranc made use of the opportunity now placed in his hands, and refused to consecrate Thomas unless he would first profess obedience and subjection to Canterbury. Lanfranc persuaded the king that, for the sake of the unity of the kingdom, it was necessary that there should be but one metropolitan. William therefore insisted that Thomas should make the required submission, and the dispute was terminated for the present by Thomas professing subjection to Lanfranc individually, but not to his successors. This occurred in 1070, and in the following year both archbishops went together to Rome to receive their palls. There the controversy was renewed, and Lanfranc asserted that Gregory I. intended York to be equal to London, but not to Canterbury, an argument which was manifestly unfair, inasmuch as the primatial dignity of Canterbury was never contemplated. Alexander cautiously abstained from expressing any opinion in the matter, and referred it to a national synod, which should be held in England. A synod was accordingly held on their return from Rome, at which the eloquence and ready wit of Lanfranc prevailed. It was ordained that the northern archbishops should swear allegiance to Canterbury and appear with their suffragans at the councils, &c., to which they should be summoned. Thomas

seems to have made little opposition, but was only required to give a profession of obedience in writing; and the decree of the synod was communicated by Lanfranc to the Pope.

After the death of Lanfranc the controversy was renewed. It now became the duty of Thomas to consecrate Anselm, and he went from York for this purpose, accompanied by the Dean and Chapter of his cathedral. When all the officiating prelates were assembled, Anselm's petition was read, in which he solicited consecration as Primate of all England. It was now Thomas's turn to use the opportunity of which Lanfranc had before availed himself, and he refused to consecrate a metropolitan to rule over himself. His profession of obedience had been made to Lanfranc, but not to his successors, and all the entreaties of the southern prelates were insufficient to move him from his purpose. The petition was therefore altered, and the words Metropolitan of Canterbury were substituted for Primate of England. The consecration then took place and the see of York regained the advantage it had lost twenty years before.

Again the controversy was renewed in 1101, when Gerard Bishop of Hereford was translated to York. Gerard requested Anselm to give him letters to the Pope to enable him to obtain his pall. Anselm would only do so on the condition that Gerard should make his profession of obedience to Canterbury, either immediately or when he returned from Rome. Gerard replied that, when he came back, he would do what was just and right, and thereupon he crossed the sea with a missive from the King to Pope Pascal II., requesting him to bestow the pall upon the bearer. The controversy between the King and Anselm on the question of Investitures was now running high, a circumstance which Gerard was able to turn to his advantage. Some bishops stood in need of consecration, and Anselm refused to consecrate unless they received investiture from himself. At the request of the King, Gerard consented to do that which the Archbishop of Canterbury had refused; but the consecration did not take place in consequence of the strenuous opposition of William Giffard, Bishop-elect of Winchester, to so marked an act of intrusion. Gerard after this seems to have acted kindly towards Anselm during his exile, and to have joined with the other Bishops in entreating him to return to England. When this took place in A.D. 1106, Anselm required from Gerard his profession of obedience, and was backed in his demand by a letter from the Pope. The King endeavoured to solve the difficulty by suggesting that it was sufficient that Gerard, when Bishop of Hereford, had acknowledged his subjection to Canterbury. Anselm was not satisfied with such an evasion, as of course Gerard, Bishop of Hereford, could not be considered identical with Gerard, Archbishop of York; and it is said, but on doubtful authority, that Gerard laid his hand in that of Anselm and pro-

mised to pay him the same obedience as that which he had rendered him in a lower sphere.

Thomas, the nephew of the first Norman Archbishop, was the next occupant of the see of York. As soon as his election was made known, the monks of Canterbury prevailed on Anselm to demand from him a profession of obedience. Thomas was supported not only by his Chapter, but also by the King, who forbade the profession to be made. Anselm would yield nothing, and therefore Henry, who was in Normandy, wrote to him desiring that the dispute might stand over until his return to England. In the meantime Henry made a request to the Pope that he would send some competent agent to England to settle the question, and to bring with him the pall which Thomas desired. In acquiescence with this request Cardinal Ulric was despatched from Rome, but ere he reached Normandy, Anselm had passed away from the strifes and controversies of earth. It may seem to some a painful feature in this holy man's last days, that on his deathbed he indited a letter to Thomas, in which, in the sight of the Most High, he besought him to return to his allegiance to Canterbury, invoking the anger of God if he persisted in rebellion. It is not, however, for us to judge harshly. Anselm had throughout the controversy acted from a highly conscientious feeling of his responsibility in vindicating what he believed to be the honour of his see, and to this sense of duty he was faithful to the last. His spirit was undaunted amidst the weakness of a deathbed, and he determined to transmit to his successors the trust he had received. His last letter to Thomas is, therefore, only an evidence of the sincerity of his purpose and the purity of his intention.

When Ulric came and the question was debated, the determination of Henry was shaken by the importunity of the southern prelates, and Thomas was required to make the profession to Canterbury. After much demur, at the entreaty of his own family, and impelled by stern necessity, the Archbishop of York made his profession on Sunday, June 27, 1109. The honour of his see was not, however, compromised, for, at the king's request, the Bishops of Norwich and Durham declared aloud in the church that Thomas had made his submission to Canterbury in obedience solely to his royal master's wish, and not upon the merits of the controversy. Henry also gave him an encyclical letter, in which it was distinctly declared that the act was in no respect to compromise the rights and privileges of the Church of York and its Archbishops. Immediately after this Thomas and the Cardinal set out for York, where they were welcomed with most enthusiastic rejoicings. Within the Minster, accompanied with a stately ceremonial, the pall was delivered by Ulric to Thomas; and when this was over, after a sojourn of three days, the Cardinal-legate prepared for his departure. The Archbishop, anxious to pay him all possible honour,

accompanied him as far as the Trent, and there, when they were about to part, to the great astonishment of Thomas, instead of the affectionate farewell which he expected, he received a formal summons to Rome. Ulric told him that in making the profession he had broken the decree of Gregory and the Canons, and for this he must answer to the Pope. Why Ulric refrained from giving expression to this opinion, when his advice was sought before, we are not told; but now his good nature prevailed over his sense of justice. He did not wish to deprive York of the presence of its Primate, and, therefore, at the Archbishop's entreaty, he recalled his words, and the controversy again rested until it was destined to break out more fiercely in the days of his successor.

Thomas died in A.D. 1113, and the celebrated Thurstan was nominated to succeed him. This energetic and stout-hearted prelate was not one to yield his just claims, as his predecessors had been induced to do. He took the bull by the horns, as the saying is, and went at once to the king to represent the case. Inverting the argument of Lanfranc, he said that it was improper that a Metropolitan should make two professions of obedience, one to the Pope and another to his brother Metropolitan. Supposing that a dispute arose between the king and the southern primate, the Archbishop of York, in consequence of his oath, would be obliged to obey the latter. This argument weighed with the king, and he told the Count de Meulent that he should not require Thurstan to make any profession of obedience to Canterbury.

Thurstan, only as yet a subdeacon, was now ordained deacon by William, Bishop of Winchester. After his enthronization at York, he took counsel with the chapter respecting the profession. They told him that on his side there was custom, justice, and the decree of Gregory, and on the other the king and nearly the whole of England. It was not, they said, for them to advise him, since no one was better acquainted with the Canons than himself; but if he declined to make the profession and was ejected, they would obey no one else. Thurstan therefore determined to bring the matter again before the Pope.

The Archbishop of Canterbury now requested Thurstan to come to him to be ordained Priest and consecrated Bishop, but instead of complying he went to the king who was in Normandy, and requested permission to proceed to Rome. Ralph, the Archbishop of Canterbury had, however, anticipated him, and the king was induced to put his veto on the journey. Henry asked the advice of the Cardinal Archbishop of Præneste, who was at that time Legate in France, who told him that Thurstan might easily be ordained Priest by one of the Suffragans at the Court, and that he could then direct him to the Pope, who would solve the difficulty at once by consecrating Thurstan himself, and then giving him the pall. Thurstan was accordingly ordained Priest by Flambard, Bishop of

Durham, but Henry would not permit him to be consecrated at Rome. The Court soon afterwards returned to England, and Thurstan, by the king's advice, now requested Ralph to consecrate him. Ralph still refused to do so without the profession, and declared, when Thurstan announced his intention of appealing to Rome, that if the Pope were to meet him face to face, and order the consecration, he would not comply. Thurstan represented this to the king, as well as the injury which the Church at York was suffering in being left as a flock without a shepherd.

In the meantime the Chapter of York had written to the Pope, announcing Thurstan's election, and deprecating the delay of his consecration. From some unknown cause a whole year passed away before these letters were delivered, but when at length Pascal received them, he at once confirmed the choice of the election, and directed the Archbishop of Canterbury to consecrate Thurstan without any profession. When these missives reached England in Lent, A.D. 1116, Henry, who had been brought over to take the side of Canterbury, sent to Thurstan, intreating him, as a matter of personal gratitude to himself, not to break the customs of the land and scandalize the Church by withholding his submission. Thurstan boldly replied that, whilst he would do all that lay in his power to prove his gratitude to the king, he would never surrender the rights of his see, and that therefore he could not make a profession which was contrary to the decrees of Gregory, Honorius, and Urban. The king was angry, and threatened the Archbishop elect with banishment and ruin; and Thurstan was still undaunted, but offered to restore to the king all that he had received from him. An interview took place between them, at which Thurstan resigned to Henry as his suzerain everything that he possessed. Sympathy with Thurstan was now universally aroused; the Chapter of York wrote to him commending his conduct, and exhorting him to perseverance, while the Pope sent a sharp reproof to Ralph, and ordered him to give way. Ralph disregarded the Papal mandate, and Thurstan entreated the king to meet the difficulty by the appointment of another Archbishop.

This Henry would not do, for, with all his vacillation, it is evident that he entertained a sincere regard for Thurstan, who accompanied him to Normandy about this time, but was not permitted to proceed to Rome as he desired. A deputation from the York Chapter waited on the king to demand their Archbishop as a matter of right and justice; but it was long before the king would see them, and when he did, the only satisfaction, which they could obtain, was a promise that the king would take the matter into his consideration. Thurstan again requested to be allowed to go to Rome, but Henry bade him wait until the Archbishop of Canterbury returned. When Ralph came back, he suggested that if Thurstan should be permitted to go to Rome, he would probably

be consecrated there. A letter from the Chapter of York, which had been sent for Thurstan to convey, was forwarded to the Pope, who replied by requesting Henry to restore the see of York to the Archbishop elect, and to hasten his consecration. Pascal ordered Ralph to dispense with the profession, and empowered the Suffragans of York to proceed to the consecration, if he still persisted in his refusal. Thurstan returned to York and was received with much rejoicing, while Ralph tarried on the Continent to avoid the fulfilment of the Pope's command.

At this juncture Pascal unfortunately died, and on the succession of Gelasius II. the dispute was commenced anew. A messenger was immediately despatched to the new Pope to state the case, whilst Thurstan hurried to the king to complain of Ralph's delay. Ralph now refused to obey the mandate of a Pope who was dead, and before the matter could be settled Gelasius also died, and was succeeded in February, 1119, by Calixtus II. Calixtus shortly afterwards held a council at Rheims, to which he requested Henry to send both Archbishops. The king endeavoured but in vain to extract a promise from Thurstan that he would not be consecrated at Rheims, but at length he suffered him to depart, after he had been assured by Warlewast, Bishop of Exeter, that there was no chance of his being consecrated by the Pope. Thurstan was received with open arms at the Papal Court, which was at Tours, and as soon as they reached Rheims, Calixtus at once proceeded to consecrate him with his own hands. Ralph had not yet arrived, and amidst the general exultation, one voice alone dissented. This voice was that of John, Archdeacon of Canterbury, Ralph's nephew, who protested against this apparent violation of the privileges of his uncle. The English and the Norman Bishops arrived that night, but the utmost they could do was to hold aloof from Thurstan. The king of England was indignant, when he heard the news, and declared that Thurstan should never enter England whilst he lived, unless he professed obedience to Canterbury. A meeting, however, was arranged between the Pope and Henry, when Calixtus told the king that he had consecrated Thurstan in order that the dispute might be afterwards adjudicated at Rome, and implored Henry to deal kindly with Thurstan. The king suggested as a compromise that Thurstan should make a profession of obedience to Ralph, but not to his successors, and alleged the vow that he had made that Thurstan should never enter England without making the profession. Calixtus refused to accede to this, and offered to absolve the king from the vow, which he said was unlawful, but Henry was not to be prevailed on to alter his determination, and so they separated.

When Henry returned to England his first act was to seize on all the Archiepiscopal property of York. Thurstan took refuge at the Papal Court, where he was received as the guest whom all de-

lighted to honour. At the coronation of Calixtus, the exiled Archbishop occupied a distinguished place in the cavalcade, and the Pope presented him with 200 bezants of gold, the same sum which all the Cardinals received. He was allowed the unusual privilege of wearing his pall in the Pope's presence, and was invited to sit with the Cardinals in their secret conclaves.

Henry sent Warlewast to negotiate with the Pope, but the determination of Calixtus was not to be shaken. The Papal bull was affixed to a charter which exempted the see of York for ever from the jurisdiction of Canterbury; and Henry was threatened with excommunication if he continued to be contumacious. With letters to this effect Thurstan departed to his diocese, accompanied by the Pope's blessing and the tender adieus of his friends. The Pope presented him with some holy oil, which was long preserved in the minster at York, and jocularly remarked, when he gave it, "If you had asked me for my own blood, you should not have been refused." The Bishops and Cardinals escorted him out of the town of Rimini, and so he went on his way, welcomed and feasted wherever he came. Conon, the Papal Legate, undertook to negotiate with Henry, who, after a long debate, offered to reinvest Thurstan with the temporalities of his see, if he would abstain for a time from entering England. Conon refused to assent, but Thurstan was more compliant than his friend, and yielded to the King's wishes. Peace was now restored between Henry and Thurstan, and all animosities were forgotten. Henry returned to England in November, and it was arranged that the Archbishop should follow at Christmas; but the King had scarcely arrived in England, when the lamentable news reached him of the shipwreck and loss of his only son,—a blow from which he never recovered. Thurstan's heart bled for the affliction of his royal master, and all his sufferings were forgotten in the fulness of his sympathy. Thurstan was summoned to England, and great was the joy at York when the long exiled Archbishop was seen in the noble minster.

It might now have been expected that Thurstan would have been allowed to devote the rest of his days to the care of his diocese; but, alas! the controversy was soon re-opened, and the Archbishop thirsted in vain for peace. Ralph, who was now on his death-bed, gained the ear of the King, who was always amenable to his influence. He told him that the monks of Canterbury had discovered several Papal grants and privileges, assuring to their Church the rights on which Calixtus had trenched. Henry was therefore persuaded to summon Thurstan to a council which was to be held at Michaelmas, 1121. When Henry renewed the old subject of dispute, Thurstan replied, "If I refused to make this profession before I was formally exempted from it by the Pope, I am much less likely to submit to it now. Why does the King ask me

to do this, which, if done, would bring me under an anathema?" The decree of Calixtus was shown to the Bishops, who exclaimed, when they heard it, "It is a forgery!" "That cannot be," replied one of the York clergy, "as I saw it myself come from the Pope's hands." No reply could be made to this, and the men of Canterbury were mute.

Two days after this Ralph died, and soon afterwards a messenger from Rome arrived, summoning both Archbishops to a council at the Lateran. Thurstan's departure was delayed until after the election of William de Corbeil, in February, 1128, to the vacant see of Canterbury. Corbeil and Thurstan both started for Rome, but Thurstan was the first to arrive. Corbeil had been consecrated by his suffragans, and not by Thurstan. The Pope, objecting to the validity of his election and consecration, refused him the pall; but, at the intercession of Thurstan, this privilege was afterwards conceded. As soon, however, as the pall was secured, Corbeil's party turned on Thurstan in the most ungrateful manner, and the Bishop of S. David's revived the question of the profession. He asserted that the recent Papal grant was in direct contravention to the privileges of the Church of Canterbury. The privileges of which he spoke were read. It was asked whether these privileges had bulls appended to them. "No," was the reply, "but the originals were at home." They were asked to swear to this, and after some hesitation they admitted that the bulls were either wasted away or lost. The improbability that the parchment should survive the leaden bulls was apparent. It was then suggested, but in vain, that it was probable that at so early a period the leaden bulls were not affixed. Thurstan had none of the muniments of the Church of York with him, but some of his followers had copies. The letters and decrees of Gregory, Honorius, Urban, Pascal, and Calixtus were recited. The Pope, unwilling to decide in the absence of evidence, deferred the question, and the two Archbishops returned home.

In the following year, 1124, Calixtus died, and was succeeded by Honorius II., who sent the Cardinal de Crema as his legate to England. In the same year the two Archbishops were again summoned to Rome, but in their way they visited the court in Normandy. Henry now renewed his attempt to enforce the profession on Thurstan, but with no greater success than before. An offer was made that, if Thurstan would merely verbally acknowledge Corbeil as Primate, committing his successors to a more humiliating form of subjection, the see of Canterbury should be dismembered, and the Bishoprics of Bangor, Lichfield, and another which was not named, should be given up to York. This was proposed to the Pope, as well as a suggestion that the legatine power should, if possible, be secured to Corbeil and his successors. The following year the two Archbishops went to Rome, but nothing

was settled except the appointment of Corbeil as legate in England.

The controversy now slept awhile, and when it again appears, it is connected with the troubled fortunes of Thomas à Becket. In A.D. 1163, Roger, who was then Metropolitan of York, is found advising Henry II. to adopt such measures as brought about the Constitutions of Clarendon. As a reward for his aid, and an opportunity of humiliating Becket, the King was desirous that the Pope should appoint Roger his legate in England. The old feud was thus revived; for Pope Alexander not only appointed Roger legate, but gave him authority to bear his cross erect in any part of England. The unflagging resistance of Becket, however, made him waver, and he first requested Roger not to act for awhile, and afterwards neither to act as legate, nor bear his cross erect in the province of Canterbury. The dispute between the metropolitan sees was increased by several circumstances of minor importance, until at length it reached its height, when, in A.D. 1170, Roger, in obedience to his royal master, crowned Prince Henry King of England. Becket, on whom the office would naturally have devolved, aware of his intention before the ceremony, appealed to the Pope, who wrote to Roger, forbidding him to officiate. The Pope's letter, if received in time, was altogether disregarded; and then, at Becket's request, Alexander III. suspended Roger, and excommunicated the southern prelates who had officiated at the coronation, at the same time expressing his willingness to withdraw the ban if the culprits would be obedient to Becket, and give him satisfaction for their conduct. Becket now returned to England, and entered into negotiation with his recusant suffragans. Roger advised them that they could not obey the Pope's order without treason to the King, and is also reported to have said, "I have £8,000, God be thanked; and I will spend it all, to the last farthing, to pull down the arrogance of Becket, which is greater than his courage. Let us go to the King, who has hitherto stood our friend. If you return to Becket, the King, if he takes it amiss, will deprive us of our possessions. What will you do then?" Roger, with the Bishops of London and Salisbury, then proceeded to the King, and stated their case. Then it was that Henry gave vent to the incautious utterance which cost Becket his life. The excitement of popular feeling, raised against Henry, extended to Roger, who was supposed to be implicated in the crime. An inquiry was instituted, and Roger promised to abide by the decision of the Pope. He swore that he was innocent of Becket's death, and that he had not received the Pope's letter when Prince Henry was crowned. Roger was unanimously acquitted of all blame, and his suspension was removed. The dispute between the rival sees nevertheless continued in the days of Richard, who succeeded Becket, until it was finally decided at a council at the Lateran in 1179, when Pope

Alexander settled the dispute entirely in accordance with the ancient decree of Gregory, and forbade for ever the profession of obedience, which the Archbishops of Canterbury had so long claimed from the northern Primates.

The right of the Archbishops to bear their cross erect out of their respective provinces continued for more than a century to be a cause of dissension. We find a licence from Archbishop Greenfield, bearing date Sept. 15, 1314, "to John, Earl of Surrey, to have an oratory at Clifton, near York, during the continuance of the present Parliament, provided that Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, does not go there with his cross erect." In 1352, the controversy was finally brought to an end, when the Archbishops Islip of Canterbury and Thoresby of York agreed to a compromise, by which it was arranged that each Primate should be allowed to bear his cross erect in the province of the other; but, as an acknowledgment of this concession, Thoresby, within the space of two months, and each of his successors within the same period from his election, was to send a knight or a doctor of laws to offer, in his name, at the shrine of S. Thomas of Canterbury, an image of gold of the value of £40, in the fashion of an Archbishop holding a cross, or some other jewel. At Parliaments and Councils the southern Primate was to sit on the right and the northern Primate on the left of the Sovereign. The bearers of the insignia, if they were in the open street, were to walk abreast; but, in a gateway or narrow passage, the Cross of Canterbury was to have the precedence. The Pope at the same time conferred on the Archbishop of Canterbury the title of *Primate of all England*, and on the Archbishop of York that of *Primate of England*, designations which even to this very day their successors respectively bear.

We have entered somewhat at length into the history of this controversy, because the case for York has never before been so distinctly stated. The materials used by our Church historians have mostly been derived from partizans of Canterbury, but Mr. Raine has made extensive use of the life of Thurstan by Hugh the Chanter, a MS. which still remains unpublished, but on which the editor has based the narrative of one of the most important lives which are included in the *Fasti Eboracenses*.

We should be sorry to leave our readers under the impression that the Lives of the Archbishops of York contained nothing but the records of such controversies as that which we have detailed. Those who will peruse Mr. Raine's pages for themselves will find their pains amply repaid. The biographies of saintly men will edify and encourage all. The noble acts of munificence by which some of the most glorious of our churches were erected will rebuke the scant parsimony which in our days too often passes current for Christian charity; whilst the copious extracts from the Archiepiscopal Registers give vivid pictures of social life in ages

which, on account of our ignorance respecting them, we are accustomed to designate as dark. In short, the admirable manner in which the first volume of the *Fasti* is executed leads us to look forward with more than ordinary interest to the conclusion of Mr. Raine's laborious task.

SERMONS BY A NORTHAMPTONSHIRE RECTOR.

Village Sermons, by a Northamptonshire Rector ; with a Preface on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Macmillan and Co.

WE do not profess to be scandalized by this book, but the Northamptonshire Rector should certainly have given his name; for coming, as he does, in the train of Bishop Colenso and others, he ought to be prepared to take his share of responsibility. And however modestly presented, in the guise of simple and affectionate pastoral discourses, we do not hesitate to say that his sermons are calculated to do much mischief every way, both to that class of persons who trust only in their own individual reason, and still more to the devout inquirers after truth. The former would be upheld in their self-confidence; the latter more bewildered in their notions after having read the volume than before.

We are sure that it would be impossible for anyone, quite ignorant of the Christian faith, to know where it was to be found, whether among any of the various existing shades of schism and heresy, or in the church of which our author is a Rector. Neither can we conceive that he regards it as any matter of importance, so long as a man is found searching the Scriptures with reverence, whether he look for a right interpretation from the light of his own reason, or seek in the "Holy Catholic Church" for the teaching of the HOLY GHOST dwelling therein to guide unto all truth.

This may appear harsh judgment of a work which is undoubtedly written with a good motive; and after saying so much, it will be but fair to give the "Northamptonshire Rector's" views in his own words. The preface, professing to be on the "Inspiration of Holy Scripture," might with more exactness, we think, be said to be on "the power of man, individually, to draw the line between the strictly human and the Divine in the Sacred Volume." Now the Bible is either altogether written from inspiration, or not at all. We must either admit, with Wordsworth, that "in the written Word of God there is a holy union of human with Divine, so that we are not able to draw the line where what is human ends, and what is divine begins," or, with our "rector," that the writers of Holy Scripture "may err on some subjects, as Thucydides, or

Strabo, or Pliny, or Josephus, or Gibbon, or Hume (!) may err." We must either say, with Wordsworth, that "the Bible is for all; it is for the simplest peasant, as for the wisest philosopher; it is able to make all men wise unto salvation. We cannot therefore admit, that the Bible is blemished with errors, and that it is left for the reader to separate, by his own skill, what is erroneous in it from what is true." Or, in support of our author's views of the partial inspiration of the Bible, we must say with him, that "if the Bible claims for itself plenary verbal inspiration, any error, no matter however unconnected with the object for which alone the Bible exists, must be fatal to its claims. Joshua's ignorance as to the motion of the sun, not only destroys the authority of his spiritual teaching, contained in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth chapters of the book; but places his historical statements far below those of Gibbon or Hume in value." (!)

We should think the author of "Village Sermons," is the first clergyman who has thus pitted the infidel historian Hume against the "holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST." Of Samuel the prophet he speaks very patronisingly, as follows: "Not that we, (!) therefore, claim for Samuel's statements on every subject an infallible character, but that we know him to have been an *honest* and *good man*, (!) whose testimony as a *man* is all the more credible from his inspiration as a *prophet*." We will close the notice of the preface by two quotations, which seem at first to be in opposition to the author's views. He says :

"We cannot indeed compare the Bible with any other book, or collection of books, without being struck by the contrast between them. Take for instance the Old Testament Scriptures, let us for a moment look upon them in the very lowest possible light—the light in which the sceptic himself would regard them, namely, as being merely the literature of the Hebrew nation. Examine this Hebrew literature carefully, mark the religious element in the several books; observe how this religious element runs through the whole series; note the unity of it; trace the gradual unfolding of it, its expansion as time goes on, the witness which it bears to One and the same Divine Being; mark all this with care, and then compare this Hebrew literature with the literature of any other ancient race that has come down to us—the literature of Greece or of Rome. Where is the religious element of the latter? Of what character is that element generally? Earthly, sensual. Elevated, spiritual, only in a few bright exceptions—exceptions which too well prove the rule."—P. xxix.

We will add, that Catholics are not in the habit of comparing the Bible with other books; but if by "the lowest possible light," viz., that of the sceptic, the Rector sees so much beauty therein, we would ask, by what light he usually views it? We give the concluding page of the preface :

“It is true that there have been those who, like Luther, while insisting upon this great truth,” (the witness of the Spirit bearing witness with our spirits,) “have erred in rejecting particular books of the Bible as not coinciding with their own conceptions of Divine Truth. But the real safeguard against such a danger as this is not to be found in undervaluing the witness of the Spirit, or in putting other evidence in its place; but in falling back upon that other gift of God, the witness of the Universal Church, in its earliest and purest days, to the Divine inspiration of the Canonical Scriptures. For this witness of the Universal Church to the Divine authority of the several books of Holy Scripture, what is it but the same ‘witness of the Spirit,’ speaking, not through one man only, or in one heart only, but in the heart and by the voice of the Church at large? that Church to which CHRIST has promised His continual Presence even unto the end, and of which S. Paul says that it is the Church of the Living GOD, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth? Here is the real safeguard against the misuse of the witness within us, a witness the testimony of which was never more needed than in the Church of England at this day, when the very foundations of the faith seem to so many to be shaken, and we hear on every side the question of the scoffer—What is truth? While we thankfully recognise in the Church the Divinely constituted Guardian of Holy Writ, let us listen reverently to the no less divine voice within our own hearts, attesting the truth of GOD’s written Word. May He incline the heart of this great English people to hearken to that inner voice, which still echoes the words of Him Who came into the world that He might bear witness to the truth—Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice.”—Pp. xxxvii., xxxviii.

Truly, as the “Rector” says, the Church “is the divinely constituted guardian of Holy Writ.” But where, we would ask, does he bid us seek the Church? Surely not in each individual man’s own soul, still less in his village in Northamptonshire? or even in the collective testimony of the whole body of Christians of all shades of opinion and denominations?

The sermons themselves are certainly written in a feeling and affectionate style, and the spirit of brotherly kindness and sympathy pervades the whole. They were evidently prompted by a benevolent mind, and earnestly intended to do good. And here our praise must stop, for in reality much of our author’s error proceeds from the over-kindness of his feelings leading him to forget the justice of God in the contemplation of His love. In his eagerness to prove the willingness of God to accept all who come unto Him, and in his desire for the salvation of all mankind, he supposes that the whole mass of the world are in a state for salvation, and that before being admitted into the Christian covenant—into which he would lead us to infer man is admitted; not in order to put him into a state of safety, but simply as a sign that he is in that state previously. That God is the beneficent Creator and Father of the whole heaven and earth—of all mankind—and of all living crea-

tures that move on the earth—of the vegetation—of the sun, moon, and stars—that He is the great Author of all things, we know—and that all His creatures exist by Him, and through Him, and that thus to know this Almighty FATHER is the beginning of all man's true allegiance to Himself, we know. But that this general creating love of God, that willeth not the death of his creature man, should be the same as that bestowed upon the members of the SON of His everlasting love, we deny.

That belief in the one atoning Sacrifice of the Cross is necessary to salvation, and that that Sacrifice is the sign of God's universal love we know, though it is equally a sign of His Almighty justice. But that the belief in that wondrous Love and Sacrifice is *sufficient* for salvation, and that man can possibly be in a state of grace, as the Rector says, and equally a subject of God's love in consequence of this belief—previously to his admission into membership with CHRIST in the Sacrament of Regeneration—we deny. We give the author's words :

"I have set before you the privileges which you enjoy in the Church as pledges of God's love not for yourself only, but also for those who have them not. Whatever those privileges may be, they are intended for all: Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, is the commission on which the Church rests. Every creature in all the world has a share in that message. I have said that at baptism God claims us as His children. I have tried to show you that this is no argument against our being God's children before baptism. It is because God is our FATHER, and we His children, that He gathers us into His Church; because we are His children already, therefore He has sent His own SON to raise us out of our fallen state, and to bring us to our FATHER's home. In doing this He gives us an assurance that we are His children. And not only so, but He also bestows upon us that gift of regeneration, whereby we receive a new and divine nature. This is the adoption of sons of which S. Paul speaks. But the point which I desire to press upon you here is this,—all that God does for us in His Church is done by Him because He is our FATHER, and we are His children before.

"Let us apply this to the case of children. Take the case of a child just born into the world. What is the state of that child spiritually?

"There are two very different answers to be given to that question.

"One answer is, that the child being born in sin, is a child of the devil, and lies under the wrath of God.

"This answer is partly true and partly false. It is true that the child is born in sin. So far it is quite true. But it is not true that the child is the child of the devil; it is not true that the child lies under the wrath of God. There was a time when I should have made this answer; thank God, I see differently now, and I hope to make you see differently too. I am persuaded that great injury is done to God's cause by such teaching as this, since it sets God before us as being

anything but the loving FATHER of all men. It wrongs GOD of that which is His greatest glory, namely, His goodness.

"I say, then, brethren, that if I ever taught you that a child at its birth lay under GOD's wrath, I taught you wrong. I thank GOD for giving me truer views of His nature, and the relation in which He stands to man.

"Here then is the true answer to the question I asked just now. The child is born in sin; it inherits a fallen nature from its parents; yet it is not the devil's child, it is GOD's child. It does not lie under GOD's wrath; it is the object of His tender and Fatherly love."—Pp. 84, 85.

The meaning of the words of the Church Catechism is explained away as follows,—

"They mean—deserving of wrath. Now this is a very different thing from lying under the wrath of GOD. It quite agrees with the rest of the passage which I have read. For we cannot be lying under GOD's wrath while we are the objects of His great love. But we can be the objects of His great love while we are deserving of His wrath. Instead, therefore, of being any proof that GOD is not the FATHER of all, this passage proves that He is their loving FATHER. For what is this great love wherewith He loves those who are dead in trespasses and sins, but the love of the Universal FATHER? Why does He love them with this great love, but because they are His children, and He is rich in mercy? Yes; taken in its plain literal meaning, this passage only affords us another striking proof that GOD is the loving FATHER not only of the good, but also of those who deserve His wrath; not only of those who are quickened together with CHRIST, that is, of the regenerate, but also of those who are dead in trespasses and sins."—Pp. 87, 88.

After this the Rector quotes a passage from the Baptismal Service, with the idea of making it the expositor of his own views; but which, according to our opinion, is in direct opposition to him:

"Wherefore we being thus persuaded of the good will of our Heavenly FATHER towards this infant declared by His SON JESUS CHRIST; and nothing doubting but that He favourably alloweth this charitable work of ours in bringing this infant to His holy Baptism.' Mark those words. We say that we are persuaded of GOD's 'good will' towards the child. This is before it is baptized. But how does this agree with the idea that the child is lying under the wrath of GOD? It is directly and plainly opposed to it. We are persuaded of His good will towards it declared by His SON JESUS CHRIST. Is not this just what we have seen in the passage from which the text is taken? If we are persuaded of GOD's good will towards the child, is not that as much as to say that GOD already feels towards the child with love? Yes, it is just what S. Paul tells us,—the child is by nature the child of wrath, even as others; but GOD, Who is rich in mercy, of His great love wherewith He loves it, claims it for His own child in Baptism, gives it this

pledge and assurance of His Fatherly love, and quickens it together with CHRIST. It is not that the child was not GOD's child before. It was His child from its very birth. And because it was His child, therefore its Heavenly FATHER has claimed it as His own in baptism, and taken it into His family, and sealed it with His seal, and given to it the spirit of adoption, whereby it may cry, Abba, FATHER."—Pp. 89, 90.

The expression *good-will* in no way supports the view that the infant is not "a child of wrath," for it were impossible to doubt the *good-will* of GOD towards all the creatures which He has formed, and much less towards man; for however mankind is fallen from his original estate, GOD must ever desire his restoration and salvation. It was not because the world was not lying under GOD's wrath, that His good-will induced Him to send the SON of His love to become a sacrifice on the Cross. Neither can His good-will to save all men be incompatible with His wrath, for it is because all men are from Adam's fall the children of wrath by nature, that of His infinite mercy, and with the good-will to reconcile them to Himself, He devised the plan of the Atonement, as a means by which His just anger should be appeased, and He be in a position to be reconciled to His rebellious people. The wrath of GOD rested upon men; by CHRIST's Incarnation and Death the curse was removed, that all who came to GOD through CHRIST should be accepted. The wrath of GOD still rests upon every child of Adam by nature, till it is united to CHRIST by Holy Baptism and in Him becomes a child of GOD, and a recipient of His grace. For we would bid our author remember, that the same GOD Who said to our first parents, "In the day that ye eat thereof, ye shall surely die," said also, "Except a man be born of Water and of the SPIRIT, he cannot enter the kingdom of GOD." And we regret that the Rector's congregation should be taught to lower the Sacrament of Baptism into a mere token of Divine favour, instead of the means by which they are admitted into that favour, and the beginning of Christian life.

Upon this misapprehension of so great a doctrine, we do not wonder that the author has built anything but a consistent faith. Every man is his own priest, and his own interpreter of Holy Writ; the voice of conscience is to supersede the authority of the Church; and the laws thereof, established by our LORD after His resurrection, are needless. Thus confusion and heresy cannot but run through the volume before us. To give an instance, he says, that his hearers should give an account for "the hope that is in them," in the following way:

"I believe the books of Moses to be genuine and authentic historical records, because the Jewish Church always received them as such from the earliest period of its history; and because the Christian Church received those books from the Jewish Church, which was their natural

keeper and guardian. But, beyond this historical guarantee to the genuineness and authenticity of the books of Moses, I have the word of CHRIST Himself for their forming a part of the Word of GOD, since He Himself quotes them as the Word of GOD over and over again. He sets His seal, as it were, to their claim to be regarded as the Word of GOD. He points to them as witnessing of Himself; and says that all things that are written in the Law of Moses, as well as in the Prophets and the Psalms, concerning Him must be accomplished; and that not one jot or tittle of the Law shall fail. Therefore I believe these books to contain a portion of GOD's Word. I have CHRIST's Word for it, Who is the Truth itself. And I find on searching these ancient records, so religiously preserved by GOD's chosen people, that they testify to Him from first to last both by type and by prophecy. I find the promise contained in the third chapter of Genesis, that the seed of the woman should crush the head of the serpent, although bruised by it, fulfilled in CHRIST. I find the promise given to Abraham, In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, literally fulfilled in CHRIST, in Whom, at this very moment, all the nations of the earth are being blest. I find the prophecy of Moses, that a Prophet should arise like unto him, in whose mouth GOD's Word should be, fulfilled in CHRIST. I find, in short, these books, from the beginning to the end, testifying to CHRIST as He Himself declares. For all these reasons, then, I believe these books to contain a true record of GOD's earlier revelations of Himself to man.

"But I have yet another testimony to the Divine authority of the teaching of these books of Moses. My own heart and conscience assure me that the Moral Law which they contain is indeed GOD's Law. This commandment which Moses commanded the people of Israel is not hidden from me, neither is it far off. It is not beyond the sea. I have not to go to Judea or to Horeb for it. I have not to listen to it from Mount Sinai, or to read it in Hebrew characters upon those two tables of stone. For it is very nigh me; it is in my own heart, written there by GOD's hand, that I might know it and do it."—Pp. 293, 294.

The following is, if possible, more vague and unsatisfactory still:

"Now since the one great object of the Bible is to reveal GOD to us—to show us GOD as He is, and to teach us to know Him—and since, also, we were ourselves formed in His image and likeness, we should expect that the GOD revealed to us by the Bible would be the same GOD Whose image we bear, and to Whose perfections our own moral consciousness bears witness. If the GOD Who has revealed Himself in the Bible be indeed the GOD Who made us after His own likeness, we should expect to find the witness of the Bible and the witness of our own hearts agreeing with regard to Him. If they did agree, we should feel sure that the Being Who has spoken to us through the Bible is the same Who formed us in His own image and likeness.

"Brethren, do these two witnesses agree together? You know that they do agree. Your own heart and conscience echoes the voice which speaks through Holy Scripture. You know, if you will think seriously, that the GOD Who has revealed Himself to you in CHRIST, is the same GOD Who has stamped His image upon your soul, and upon the

soul of every man, woman, and child throughout the world, heathen or Christian, civilized or savage. Yes, we have the witness in ourselves—the witness of that moral nature, that spiritual consciousness, which is ours by nature; which was implanted within us by God's hand as a witness to Himself, and which sin has not wholly effaced; this bears testimony to the truth of that revelation of God to man which the Bible contains. Look into the Gospel of CHRIST; look at the character of CHRIST; look at the teaching and the example of CHRIST; and then say whether this revelation of God in His beloved Son does not correspond exactly, line for line, and feature for feature, with that image and likeness of Himself which your Creator has impressed upon your soul? Have you not indeed the witness within yourself?"—Pp. 282, 283.

We are entering rather more fully into this book than, at first sight, seemed necessary; but the dangerous tendency of this subjective teaching, when offered in a pleasing and affectionate style, makes us anxious. It is sad, that an earnest-minded man should be thus ignorant of the common faith, of which he is a steward; that he should, in fact, be ignorant of the nature of his commission; of the power entrusted to him, and of the laws of the kingdom of CHRIST. Of the real nature of that Presence, signified in the words, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," he seems not to have a thought; for, in speaking of it, he says:

"Believe this; believe that He is with us still, unchanged in all things, except that His human nature is glorified and exalted far above the laws of this material world. Believe this; but do not be content with believing it. If you do in your heart believe it, then, secondly, you will go a step further. Believing that He is present, you will desire to come to Him. And this is the point to which, with God's help, I desire to lead you. I wish to make you think of the Blessed JESUS as still standing in the midst, and saying, Ye will not come to Me that ye might have life. I speak to those who know the troubles and sorrows of life. Let me put a case to you. Suppose you knew that there was One who felt a great interest in you and love for you. Suppose that this Person knew every circumstance of your life, all those hidden trials which make it so sore a burden to you—knew all those faults and failings which are the worst burden of all—and yet still felt for you, pitied you, loved you, and longed to do you good. Suppose, too, that it came to your knowledge that this Friend had undergone great sorrows and sufferings, prompted to do so solely by love for you. Suppose you knew of such a Friend, waiting for you to come to them, in order to confer all these benefits upon you. Would you not go to them? would not the knowledge of their sympathy and love draw you towards them?

"Brethren, there is such a Person Who is all this and more to you, Who is even now waiting for you to come to Him. He loves you. He has suffered for your sake. He knows all your thoughts and feelings, all your sorrows and sufferings, and His heart yearns over you;

He desires above all things to do you good, to comfort you, to bind up the wounds and bruises of your heart, and to pour in the oil and the wine of His consolations. All that He requires is that you should come to Him. Will you not come? He is not far from you; you have not to ascend into Heaven to find Him. Go into your chamber and shut your door, and kneel down and close your eyes, and call upon Him from your heart. There, kneeling on your knees in that room, can you speak to the Blessed JESUS. There, listening to your prayer, will He be present; present more really and truly than all outward things that you can see or feel; even He, the Son of Man, and yet the SON of GOD, your Saviour and Redeemer, your LORD and your GOD." —Pp. 118—120.

Of course we do not mean to speak lightly of the private manifestations of CHRIST to the soul, or to under-rate the value of private devotion—there can be no true religion in the man who neglects it, nor any safety for him who does never realise the sweetness of the Presence of CHRIST in the privacy of his own heart—but the Presence of the SON of GOD with His Church to the end of the world, is a promise upon which is based a deeper and wider significance than the consolation of His manifestation to individual souls, or the general superintending Presence of Almighty GOD over all His creatures. The religion of this book, which has been learnt from Mr. Maurice, is mere natural religion, which takes the words of Revelation, and quietly and "unostentatiously" divests them of all their true meaning.

THE WORK OF THE CHURCH.

1. *The Manchester Church Congress.*
2. *The Church's Work in large Towns.* By GEORGE HUNTINGTON, M.A., Clerk in Orders of the Cathedral and Parish of Manchester. London: Church Press Company.

LAST year we noticed briefly what were the chief points of interest that were brought out to view at the Oxford Meeting. And now we propose to do the same in reference to what took place at Manchester.

The general tone, it must be admitted, was not quite so high as last year. It is no great disparagement to the Bishop of Manchester to say, that he does not possess that united firmness, tact, and temper which combine to make Bishop Wilberforce so good a chairman; neither should it be considered an invidious remark to say, that the large infusion of Irish blood into the Northern Clergy

makes them somewhat more difficult to manage than those who congregated at Oxford. It happened also, unfortunately, that on three of the most important subjects the Advocates who would have been best able to deal with the question under discussion, failed to make their appearance. At the same time, the result of the Manchester discussion will, we believe, be upon the whole more beneficial to the Church, than if higher ground had been taken.

1. First among the gains of the Congress we are disposed to reckon the unmistakeable conviction that seemed to have forced itself upon the minds of reflecting persons that Scripture Readers have proved to be of much less real value than what the clergy who employed them had expected. This was very plainly said by two witnesses, who were quite above suspicion, Mr. Rowsell and Mr. G. Venables; and although one of the officials of the Society attempted to defend them, it was plain that the meeting did not go at all along with him. The change of sentiment on the subject is really very remarkable, when taken in connection with the almost universal advocacy of Lay co-operation. The cause of the failure indeed seemed scarcely to be recognized by the meeting. Laymen undoubtedly ought to aid the clergy; but they should be laymen who are themselves well-instructed in the Faith, and who are jealous for the Church's discipline. But where shall we find such? We cannot find clergy who are qualified in any sufficient number. Happily a clergyman is, in some degree, restrained as well by the Prayer Book, to the use of which he is tied, as by public opinion. But place many of our present clergy in the position of Scripture Readers, and let them make out a system of teaching and acting for themselves, and the result would be something appalling.

It is this conviction, we presume, which has led the Managers of the Parochial Mission Women Association to forbid their agents from attempting to teach at all in their visits. This may be a necessary restriction; but the result is, that their sphere of usefulness will be very narrow. This, by the way.

2. The next most important gain is the distrust, which is evidently growing in all directions, of a literate clergy. Here again the speakers generally stopped short of the truth. There was no adequate exposure, as we know there would have been had sufficient time been allowed for open discussion, of such very imperfect make-shifts as S. Aidan's, and S. Bee's, and Lampeter. The charge that we bring against these Institutions—and we fear that we must include King's College and Trinity College, Dublin—is two-fold. They sin by omission and by commission. First, they profess only to teach, or cram. How miserably this is done by the three first, the course which they follow, and the manuals which they use, sufficiently show. But if this is all that is needed, why have a College at all? Examination will test what a man knows; and we should really prefer the Dublin system which requires no residence at all

to herding men in such un-ecclesiastical places as Birkenhead¹ and S. Bee's. If a thorough free trade were proclaimed, we have no doubt that the supply of candidates would be equal to the demand. But a much better system (though only a temporary one) would be for each Bishop to locate young men with clergymen who are really doing the Church's work; and the literate clergy would then be scattered through all the dioceses instead of being congregated in the dioceses of Lichfield, Chester, Carlisle, and Norwich.

2. The other charge is, that the five Institutions referred to, as well as Islington Church Missionary College, from which we see that the two last-named Bishops, and we believe the Bishops of Durham and London also occasionally ordain, are devoid of everything, either present or past, which can impress the mind by the powers of association. Even King's College, London, at the end of a quarter of a century has merely a room for its chapel.

It was suggested by Mr. Espin in the very valuable paper which he read at Manchester, that Durham was the only place which possessed the materials out of which a proper Clerical College could be constructed. We much wish that he would follow up that idea, and prefer a memorial to the Chapter of Durham, pointing out this as a great opportunity. We are sure that he would receive almost universal support. Another, and still more valuable step would be the founding of a cheap Hall in Oxford. At present the halls are on too small a scale. In order to secure cheapness you must have a large society and some endowment. And, again, if the society were large, the students would be able to create that *esprit de corps*, which is so valuable in producing self-respect, a qualification of which members of Halls in the Universities are at present quite devoid.

But of all proposals, the most objectionable that we have heard is that of enabling Lampeter to confer degrees. The foundation of that College was doubtless well intended; but now, in the days of railroads, the mischief which it effects is becoming day by day more apparent. What the candidates for Welsh orders essentially need is to be taken away from their homes and all home associations. But to shut them up in that wretched village, where there is nothing to open the mind or to improve the heart, is the greatest mockery of education that can be conceived.

3. Another point on which we observed a very decided growth of sentiment in the right direction, is the division of parishes. The creation of new districts was thought, a few years since, to be the one only form which "Church Extension" would possibly take. People did not understand that extension may only be another word for weakening; as is notoriously the case with an army when the general extends the line of his front unduly.

¹ In saying this, we give full credit to the Founder of S. Aidan's. He has done the best that he could; he has supplied what Bishops seemed to ask for.

"A growing conviction (says Mr. Huntington) is now felt that separation may be carried too far, and that it is better to attach endowed curacies to the original mother churches than to cut off pauperized districts, on the very sensible grounds that the curates would then be under the direction of experienced incumbents, and that in a financial point of view there would be a great saving, since an unbeneficed clergyman might be considered comparatively rich on £150 a-year, whilst an incumbent, with the many expenses connected with a living of the same value, would hardly be able to keep himself from starving."—P. 198.

Another kindred fallacy seems also generally about to be abandoned, viz., the idea that poor people prefer a mean place for worship to one more magnificent. Here again we gladly quote Mr. Huntington:—

"There must be no meanness in the arrangement of our churches and Services—no shabbiness—no stint of the Holy Offices of prayer and praise—no pitiful condescension to the poor man as though he were a being of inferior grade and intellect—no absence of adornment, as though, while God has given the ever-varying beauties of light and shade to rich and poor alike, from church alone these things should be excluded."—P. 34.

And then after quoting a passage to the same effect from Archdeacon Sandford's Bampton Lectures, he goes on to say that though the working classes may go to theatres or assembly rooms, it is only—

"because they are shut out of church,—because it has become fashionable to do so,—because there is something novel in the idea of seeing in a theatre religious men who place a ban on the legitimate uses for which a theatre is designed,—or even because the hebdomadal supply doled out at church may chance to be neither digestible nor pleasant. But they do not prefer an unconsecrated to a consecrated building, nor strangers to their own vicar, if he be such as he ought to be. They do not like whitewash and yellow-ochre better than frescoes and mosaics, or plain sashed windows than stained glass. They do not think the arrangement of pit, boxes, and gallery, preferable to 'long-drawn aisle and fretted vault.' To use their own words, 'they like a church to be church-like.' They can appreciate reverence as well as their betters, and I believe that the right-thinking among them are utterly averse to the burlesque indulged in by those who think themselves specially called to minister to the working classes. What they want is freedom of access, freedom of worship, and for churches to be what they should be in structure, ritual, and arrangement; and, though they may for a time have got unused to our Services, they will eventually learn to appreciate the beautiful and true.

"Well would it be if the Dean and Chapters of S. Paul's and Westminster could be induced to settle in their own minds for what class of persons they design the special Services held in the noble fabrics which they hold in trust for the people of England—whether for temporary visitors during the 'season' or for the permanent inhabitants. If for

the former class, then they act wisely in suspending these Services when the wealthy and gay have taken their departure. If for the latter, then the ceaseless round of prayer and praise and thanksgiving must go on the whole year round, and at such hours as are most convenient. Fast and Festival, Saint Day and Vigil, should be duly marked. The sacred seasons of Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Passiontide, Easter, Pentecost, and Trinity, should be brought prominently before the eyes of the people by holy ritual and devout commemoration; thus setting forth CHRIST our LORD, the King of Saints, not only as the Seeker and SAVIOUR of that which was lost, but as the Incarnate Head of His Body Mystical.

"But, in order to make this scheme or any preaching whatever efficacious, duly qualified priests ought always to be in attendance, to deepen and strengthen the otherwise transient effects of human eloquence by intimate personal communication with the individual soul. The confessor must attend the preacher, to hear the opening out of the griefs of those whose fears have been excited, or whose hopes have been kindled, to bring home conviction of guilt, and a sense of pardoning mercy, and to give to all who ask it the absolution and remission of their sins.

"By the combination of the prophetic and sacerdotal function alone can special Services be really instrumental for good, both as means of evangelization and of building up the faithful. What arrangements would be necessary it is not for me to pronounce; but, doubtless, there are Bishops and Priests sufficiently zealous for the salvation of souls to undertake the work. Of one thing I am certain, that nothing could be better devised, not only to win the masses of the people to the faith of their forefathers, but to give them all they are seeking for through modern so-called revivals, without the heresy and blasphemy which have so often attended those exhibitions. Of one thing I am persuaded, that, while restored and open churches are bringing back thousands to the fold of CHRIST, every pewed place of worship offers an insuperable obstacle to the preaching of that Gospel which is said to be 'without money and without price,' and puts off *sine die* any effectual remedy for the spiritual destitution of our large towns."—Pp. 35—37.

4. Again we were glad to note at Manchester the prevalence of sounder views in relation to the Prayer Book. Several speakers asked for additional Services, but there was no mention of any revision of those which we now use. To the same effect Mr. Huntington urges that "the Prayer Book should be regarded in its integrity as the very symbol of the maintenance of the Church's faith."

Were anything to be attempted in this way, it ought, we have no doubt, to be a second Sunday Evening Service, with lessons both shorter and better adapted for the Ecclesiastical seasons than some now are.

The last feature we consider far more important than the former; for it seems to be the general result of experience that congregations are not satisfied with the abridgment of our existing services.

5. The topic, which of all perhaps was most enthusiastically received by the meeting was the advocacy of Free Churches, and—what is practically involved in their establishment—the use of the Offertory for the whole congregation. But this perhaps was sufficiently touched upon last year. Several speakers, however, declared themselves to be recent converts to the system, and the movement is very far indeed, we are sure, from having reached its full maturity of growth.

The increase of the Episcopate and the best character of Church music are subjects which we hope will have a prominent place assigned to them at the next Congress. Sir Frederick Onseley's lecture was, in the main, an *éloge* on English Cathedral music. In the historical portion of it there seemed to us some very questionable theories propounded. A decidedly good feature in the Congress was Mr. Beresford Hope's Lecture on Architecture, which needed, however, to be supplemented by some other paper in the same direction. Perhaps another year a Paper on Ecclesiastical Embroidery may be given.

To Mr. Huntington we beg to offer our best thanks. A more out-spoken, and at the same time more sober, volume has rarely appeared.

ANTIPHONS AND INTROITS.

Words of the Introits throughout the Year. London: Palmer.

WE have certainly reason to be thankful that hitherto one part of the reconstruction of the Church's Offices has been left incomplete, an authorized Hymnal; for, judging from the style of hymns which has been in use in the Church since the reformation of her offices, we have every assurance that it would have been a miserable failure. For the space of three hundred years the majority of churchmen have submitted to the platitudes of Sternhold and Hopkins, or Tate and Brady. Up to the present century hymn books were quite the exception; and it was to the warmer feelings of the Evangelicals, who naturally found the spiritless "version of the Psalms" utterly unfitted for anything like real devotion, that we owe their introduction. But then the distrust of the Evangelicals was so great, that in effect their advocacy of hymns only tended more to strengthen that incredible and obstinate attachment to Tate and Brady which prevailed among the great mass of the clergy, and does yet obtain in so many country parishes. Further, there existed a general apathy in regard to all that raised worship from the monotony of a service merely read from a printed book. We cannot help expressing our astonishment that our contemporary the *Clerical Journal*, which in other respects is less prejudiced, yet

in this still recommends that the hymnology of the Church should be confined to those insipid rhymes, *plus* the few hymns bound up with them, in the Prayer Book published by the S. P. C. K. We have a lively recollection of the days of our youth, when the singing, and the words sung, in our parish church, were too often a theme for ridicule and laughter. And, in later days, when an increasing apprehension of what worship should be was dawning upon us, the wearied feeling of disgust at the sameness and monotony caused by the unchanged repetition, through fast and festival alike, of the eternal Tate and Brady, and the utter impossibility of adapting its Christless platitudes to the great Christian festivals, and to express the devotion of the worshipper, is fresh in our memory.

That a great and mighty change has come over the mind and feeling of the Church in the matter of hymnology is only to be expected from the general progress in all other matters connected with ritual and worship. But we do know that there is yet a very large section of our clergy who would cling to the last to the former state of things, and barely permit a modification of them: we need but refer to the "*Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship*," published by the S. P. C. K., as a proof; we could, were the fact not notorious, mention numbers of other "*Hymn Books*" where the same meaningless division appears. A glance at the advertisements in the *Guardian* or other Church papers gives evidence of the fact. Wherein consists the difference between *Psalms* and *Hymns* as they are written in those books we have never been able to discover, nor has any one, even of those who approved of this arrangement, been able to enlighten us.

As an instance of this curious and incomprehensible distinction, we have among the *Psalms* Tate and Brady's 23rd, by the way one of the best, "*The LORD Himself, the mighty LORD,*" &c.; and among the *Hymns* the version of Addison's "*The LORD my pasture shall prepare*"—Will any one inform us why Tate and Brady's version of Psalm xxiii. is a psalm, and why Addison's version of the same Psalm is a hymn?

Psalms differ essentially from *Hymns*, both as requiring a different style of music, and as being the one in prose, the other in rhyme and numbers. But the moment you put the former into the shape of the latter, or rather you paraphrase the former, and turn its sentiments into measured and rhyming verse, it ceases to be a psalm, and becomes a hymn proper. The "*Old Hundredth*" is quite as much a hymn as any of Bishop Ken's, or any of the translations in the "*Hymnal Noted*;" if there are any portions of Tate and Brady worthy of being sung, they should be introduced into the body of a hymnal, along with other paraphrases of Scripture; there is absolutely no sense in keeping them distinct. Yet such is the extraordinary force of prejudice that we are sure had there been carried out what has been proposed in both Convocations, a

committee to frame a hymnal, this absurd arrangement would have obtained : we therefore look upon the failure hitherto as a real blessing to the Church. Let us look into the facts of the case.

We suppose that the "selection" of so-called Psalms in the S. P. C. K. collection is the best that can be made from the two versions, old and new ; but of all these there is not one, we confidently affirm, fitted for any of the Church festivals, or indeed for any of the seasons excepting the penitential one of Lent ; some are so utterly unmeaning that we cannot understand how they can be used. We shall give two examples, one from each "version."

"PSALM xviii. 9, 10, 30. O. V.

"The LORD descended from above,
And bow'd the heavens high ;
And underneath His feet He cast
The darkness of the sky.

"On cherubs and on cherubims
Full royally He rode,
And on the wings of mighty winds
Came flying all abroad.

"For who is GOD, except the LORD ?
For other there is none :
Or else who is Omnipotent,
Saving our GOD alone ?"

The two first verses are connected, and lead us to expect some statement consequent on the declaration of GOD's power and glory, like that in the Psalm of which this is supposed to be a version, but we look in vain. Nothing appears but a meaningless question with which the so-called Psalm ends.

"PSALM lxxv. 1, 2, 3. N. V.

"For Thee, O GOD, our constant praise
In Sion waits, Thy chosen seat ;
Our promised altars there we'll raise,
And all our zealous vows complete.

"O Thou, Who to my humble prayer
Didst always bend Thy list'ning ear,
To Thee shall all mankind repair,
And at Thy gracious throne appear.

"Our sins, though numberless, in vain
To stop Thy flowing mercy try ;
Whilst Thou o'erlook'st the guilty stain,
And washest out the crimson dye."

Setting aside the very questionable statement in the last verse, which alone should have excluded it from this collection, we ask if it is in any sense a version of "My misdeeds prevail against me : oh, be Thou merciful unto our sins ?" or if it is, is there any meaning

in a choir and congregation standing up and singing these three verses? and yet this is only a type of the one hundred and seven "selections" which this volume gives. And all this, be it remembered, to the exclusion of the glorious old Christian hymns of the Catholic Church; for it is an actual fact that even the "Adeste Fideles" does not occur in this collection. Yet we again express our opinion, that had there been an authorized hymnal issued, it would, in most respects, have resembled it. A member of Convocation actually recommended it as supplying the need complained of, and therefore not necessitating a new one: an opinion that seemed to be generally assented to.

As a further proof, if any were wanting, of the fact we have stated, we may look to the proceedings of the two Churches in Scotland, and in the States of America. Some six or seven years ago a committee of priests and laymen was appointed by the Synod to draw up a hymnal for the use of the Scotch Church. Again, we had "Psalms and Hymns,"—the latter a singular medley of Catholic and Protestant doctrine. The book was rejected, providentially we think; but the reason given shows clearly what would have been the fate of a far better one, *There were too many mediæval hymns*; and this in the face of the copious dilution of Psalms and Protestant hymns. In 1832 the Church in the North American States actually committed itself to this blunder; the General Convention sanctioned a hymnal, which is now, we suppose, in general use. The contents are as follows:—one hundred and twenty-four "Selections from the Psalms;" two hundred and twelve "hymns suited to the Feasts and Fasts of the Church:" of which latter there are, for Advent 2, for Christmas 5, Epiphany 4, Lent 12, Easter 4, Ascension 2, Whitsunday 4, Trinity Sunday 5; that is, thirty-eight only for the great seasons between Advent Sunday and Trinity Sunday, and 27 for the occasional offices. The rest, 147, are arranged under six heads, such as "Repentance," "Faith," &c., &c.

Here it is clear the Church must perforce content herself with a colourless expression of praise almost unvaried; and bring down the voice of Christmas and Easter to the level of that of the season between Trinity and Advent. There is, of course, very great excuse for anything done so long ago as thirty years, when we may say, very few, even in our own country, were acquainted with the Latin hymns, and no translation of them existed: things would not have been better in our own Church at the same period.

The publication of the "Hymnal Noted" formed a sort of era in modern hymnology. Used in its integrity in very few churches, it has been a mine of wealth to those who compiled hymnals; all borrowed freely from it, or modelled on its pattern. We shall not stop to specify the names or the publishers of these latter, further than to mention three, for a certain peculiarity of which we have something to speak; that published by Masters, and commonly

known as the "Cumbræ Hymnal," and that published by Mozley, simply designated "A Hymnal;" both of which have been superseded by one which instantly on its publication commended itself to the generality of Churchmen, "Hymns Ancient and Modern." We rejoice exceedingly for this general popularity; for it proves that, like as soon after the Catholic revival Gothic architecture superseded the debased productions of former times, so when a really good hymnal appeared, it too is fully appreciated. That it is capable of improvement is, of course, a point that no one will dispute, any more than that any one of good taste will not confess that it is far in advance of others. There is however one part of it which we wish to speak of more particularly, not on merely critical grounds, but for the purpose of showing how the Hymnal may be improved. The last edition of the "Hymns Ancient and Modern" has the addition of forty-six introits. It is to this part that we particularly wish to draw attention.

Any parish priest who has laboured to bring the Offices of the Church into harmony with the seasons of the year, and with themselves, must have felt the great want of the introit. In most cathedrals the "Sanctus" is wrongly sung in this place; in parish churches generally a hymn, in no particular manner differing from the hymn sung in the place of the anthem: we have known some few churches where the psalms appointed for introits in the first reformed Prayer Book have been used; but, as it is usually the case, that the Celebration is preceded by Matins, in which the psalms are sung, the singing of a psalm here is scarcely desirable. The compilers of the two hymnals we have mentioned, perceiving this need, prefixed certain passages from Scripture suitable to the greater festivals, and called them Introits.

The compilers of the "Hymns Ancient and Modern" have, as has been already said, followed these examples. Out of these forty-six, twenty-nine are for special occasions and seasons: two are for common use. All these are in the ancient form of an antiphon, and a Psalm, or a portion of a Psalm following; then three Eucharistic Hymns. These are all that can properly be termed introits. Then follow the "Great Os," or greater antiphons of Advent, commencing December 16, "O Sapientia."¹ These antiphons precede the Magnificat, and have, strictly speaking, nothing to do with introits. We have, next, the "Reproaches"

¹ In this collection the order stands thus: December 16, O Sapientia; 17, O Adonai; 18, O Radix Jesse; 19, O Clavis David; 20, O Ortem; 21, omitted; 22, O Rex Gentium; 23, O Emmanuel. In the *Nouveau Paroissien Romain*, O Sapientia commences December 17, and follows the same order. In the "*Processionale Ecclesiæ Rothomagensis*," O Sapientia commences as in the *Kalendar* of our own book, December 16, then goes on regularly to December 23, when it gives an eighth, viz., O Bone Pastor, qui requiris, et visitas oves; veni et libera eas de omnibus locis, in quibus dispersæ fuerant in die nubis et caliginis. The antiphon for S. Thomas' Day in the *Paroissien* is, Quod vidisti me, Thoma, credidisti: beati qui non viderunt et crediderunt. Alleluia.

for Good Friday, and a hymn proper for the day in two parts: then an anthem for Easter, which is a literal translation of the Easter Sequence (in modern books called the "Prose,") *Victima Paschali*, &c.; and like the Latin, it is a sort of irregular rhyme. Next, for an evening anthem, is given, "O joyful light;" and lastly, the same in irregular rhyme.

These are very important additions; important, because they are a return to ancient ritual. They follow, necessarily, we may say, the translation and adaptation of the Breviary Hymns. But they are only an instalment, they are far too few, unless, indeed, we use the *antiphon* for the season, and add to it a different Psalm each Sunday and holy day. We have spoken of anthems and antiphons, let us say a few words as to what they are. An anthem, in its largest sense, is a word of wide signification; the hymn sung after the third collect, as well as the prose composition, sung in most cathedrals at that place, is an anthem; so are the sentences of Scripture for Easter Day, which precede the Psalms, so also are the sentences in the Burial Offices. We wish, however, at present, to restrict the use of the term anthem to the prose compositions, or hymns sung after the third collect. In this, the Church allows the amplest development, both as to words and music. The antiphon differs from this in having a particular place as well as a special reference to the office of the day; in fact, it is the keynote of the office. We shall take an example from the Vesper Office, which is best known as a public office: we quote from the "*Vespéral Romain*," commonly used in France; we take an example at random, *Aux premières Vêpres, (Epiphany)* 1 Ant. 2 D. "Ante luciferum genitus, et ante secula Dominus Salvator noster hodie mundo apparuit. e u o u a e. Ps. *Dixit Dominus*, (cx.) 2 Ant. 1 G. Venit lumen tuum Jerusalem, et gloria Domini super te orta est: et ambulabunt gentes in lumine tuo, alleluia. e u o u a e. Ps. *Confitebor* (cxi.) 3 Ant. 1 F. Apertis thesauris suis, obtulerunt Magi Domino aurum, thus et myrrham, alleluia. e u o u a e. Ps. *Beatus vir* (cxii.) 4 Ant. 4 E. Maria et flumina benedicite Domino: hymnum dicite fontes Domino, alleluia. e u o u a e. Ps. *Laudate pueri*, (cxiii.) 5 Ant. 7 C. Stella ista sicut flamma coruscet, et Regem regum Deum demonstrat: Magi eam viderunt, et Magno Regi munera obtulerunt. e u o u a e. Ps. *Laudate Dominum*, (cxvii.)" Then follows the "chapter" (Isa. lx. v. 1); the Hymn "Hostis Herodes impie;" the Versicle, "Reges Tharsis, &c." then an antiphon to the *Magnificat*, "Ant. 8 G. Magi videntes stellam dixerunt ad invicem: hoc signum Magni Regis est: eamus, et inquiramus eum, et offeramus ei munera, aurum, thus, et myrrham, alleluia. e u o u a e."¹

¹ As some of our readers may not know what these mysterious looking vowels mean, we shall give an explanation; they are the vowels of the words *secularum* *aves*, which, having the notes set over them, intimate the notes by which the

When our Church reformed her offices these antiphons were left out, partly because a different arrangement of the psalms was made; only a few of the greater Festivals retaining Proper Psalms, to which alone antiphons could fitly be prefixed, and partly for the sake of simplicity, a reason given in the Preface, "concerning the Service of the Church." "Moreover, the number and hardness of the rules, called the Pie, and the manifold changings of the service, was the cause, that to turn the book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out." The only antiphons that were retained were those preceding the psalms on Easter-Day, unless the Kalendar gives sanction to the greater antiphons of Advent. We must confess that the elimination of the antiphons to the Proper Psalms is a very great loss, also those to the Magnificat; had these been retained, our Daily Office would have manifested the changes of season, and the particular Feast or Fast day, in a much more marked manner than it does now. The reason given by the compilers, of the "hardness of the rules called the Pie," certainly ought not to obtain in an age of education like the present. We must, however, content ourselves under the loss as best we can; or rather, like sensible persons, set to work to find out something that will compensate us for the removal.

The two opportunities left us for this purpose are the hymn or anthem, and the introit. With a full supply of these, properly adapted to the Offices, we can introduce much of the variety we need, and give every opportunity for development. Of the anthem or hymn we have little to say, excepting this: we think there should be one special hymn for every day which has its proper office. Hymns Ancient and Modern have not one hymn for any of the twelve Apostles or Evangelists, individually—only general ones for Apostles, Martyrs, Evangelists, &c. This should be remedied.

Of the introit we have more to say. The introit is a hymn or anthem, sung previous to the commencement of the Eucharistic Office. This in the Roman Office consists of an antiphon and a psalm. Thus in the Festival we before mentioned, the Epiphany, we have this introit:—"Ecce advenit Dominator Dominus: et regnum in manu ejus, et potestas, et imperium. Psal. *Deus judicium* (lxxii.) Gloria Patri. Ecce." [i.e. a repetition of the antiphon.] This is exactly followed in Hymns Ancient and Modern: "Behold the LORD, the Ruler is come: and dominion, power, and empire are in His hand." *Ps. viii. 1.* [misprint for lxxii. 1.] "Give the King Thy judgments, O God: and Thy righteousness unto the King's Son. Glory be to the FATHER, &c." It then orders the repetition

Psalm must end. In giving the Psalm, we have intimated it according to the number in our Psalter, not in the Roman.

The word "antienne," properly means "anthem," but is always used for antiphon in the French books; we never heard a regular anthem, in our sense of the word, in a French church.

of the antiphon. In the first reformed office the introit, without any antiphon, is Ps. xvi. The introit psalms in the latter are not the same as in the former. In the Roman Office there is an antiphon and Psalm for every Sunday and Holy-day in the year. In Hymns Ancient and Modern, there is one for the greater Festivals, and one for the Season, to be repeated on every Sunday during that time. Thus for Advent we have the antiphon, Isa. xlv. 8; the Psalm xix. 1, which in the Roman Office is that proper for the "Feria Quarta Quatuor Temporum Adventus." The Roman Office has in addition, that which must be felt by all to be one of the greatest losses we experience in ours, the Gradual, Offertorium, (proper,) and Communio. In Epiphany, the gradual is from Isa. lx. : "Omnes de Saba venient, aurum et thus deferentes, et laudem Domino annunciantes. V. Surge, et illuminare Jerusalem: quia gloria Domini super te orta est. Alleluia, Alleluia. V. Vidimus stellam ejus in oriente: et venimus cum muneribus adorare Dominum, Alleluia." The Offertorium: "Reges Tharsis et insulæ munera offerent: Reges Arabum et Saba dona adducent: et adorabunt eum omnes reges terræ, omnes gentes servient ei." The Communio: "Vidimus stellam ejus in Oriente: et venimus cum muneribus adorare Dominum." Here we have, as it were, a continual reminder of the Festival all through the Office: in our own we have nothing but the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

While, therefore, we deplore the loss of these significant portions of the Eucharistic Office, let us see if anything can be done with what remains. If it is impossible to restore the gradual and sequence,¹ we may at any rate do something with the introit. The attempt has been made, and we beg to call attention to it; we have placed at the head of this article a book of "Introits throughout the year," a book which deserves notice, as purposing to supply an acknowledged want. These introits include the antiphon and psalms, and are the same, as far as we have examined them, as those in the Roman Office. This is very important, for here we can try the effect of a mere return to ancient usage; and if the antiphon is set to simple music, there can be no difficulty at all in its adoption by any ordinary Church Choir. This collection we may add, has the advantage of giving us introits for all the minor

¹ Most of our readers will remember the time, when High Churchmen bravely faced an infuriated parish, to abolish the hymn between the Nicene Creed and the sermon, and reimpose the Prayer for the Church Militant. How shocked would they have been then, had they known that their successors, having advanced a step or two beyond them, would describe this part of the Office, which cost them so dear to establish, by the irreverent designation of "Table Prayers." Still more would they be surprised, if they were told that that hymn, which they so sternly abolished, might, with some alteration, be retained with the greatest propriety. If we could but change the place from *after* the Nicene Creed to *before* it, and take care that its character was always Eucharistic, and in strict accordance with the day or season, it would become a legitimate revival of the sequence. Perhaps this is not quite impossible, for Mr. Orby Shipley gives notice, that he is about to issue a "Lyra Messianica," hymns on the Gospels for the Day; perhaps that might do duty for sequences.

festivals as well as the greater,—a most valuable addition when there is daily celebration,—in this respect it is far in advance of “Hymns Ancient and Modern.” We believe we are right in saying that these introits are used at S. Alban’s, Holborn, where many of our readers can hear and judge for themselves.

That this book of introits is a move in the right direction, few of our readers will doubt; the mere restoration of the antiphon would be sufficient to claim attention, the only point about which there can be any doubt is, whether the use of the psalms for introits is, in our present arrangement of the Offices, most suitable; at the same time it must be confessed that we are absolutely without anything else, excepting the very meagre supply in “Hymns Ancient and Modern,” which could be used as introits. Every one must allow that something different from the ordinary hymn is wanted; we cannot now be content with a hymn that is one day to do duty for an anthem, and another for an introit: we want something marked, distinct, yet capable of being sung by any village choir, as well as to be set to more elaborate music for those more highly trained. Let us state the whole question *pro* and *con*; the point being this, is the psalm the most suitable for the introit? we suppose the retention of the antiphon in all cases. On the one side then, it is 1st, an essential part of the ancient introit; and, as given in this collection, it comes before us with *authority*, that of the Western Church. 2nd. We have nothing else except an ordinary hymn, confessedly insufficient. On the other side, 1st. The psalms having been brought into more frequent use in our Reformed Matins Office, and that Office almost universally preceding the Eucharistic, the use of a psalm here would have the appearance of a repetition of a part of the Morning Office. 2nd. Having lost the Gradual, Sequence, Offertorium, Communion, we are left without any thing distinctly Eucharistic, or having reference to the day or season. If then it is thought fit to substitute something else for the psalm—the “proper psalm” for the day having been previously used in the Matin Office—we must not have an ordinary hymn, but a composition somewhat different from both, yet having certain points of agreement; e.g., it might so far resemble a hymn as to be in rhyme and numbers; and so far a psalm as to have parallel lines or couplets, not in verses of four, six or eight lines, and capable of being sung to a sort of chant; for instance like Troyte’s two tunes. In all cases it should have reference to the day or season, and to the sacrament. It should also be a sufficient length to give time to change Vestments, light the Altar candles, and, when thought good, to bring in the elements to the credence (Little Entrance): the antiphon being repeated after it as well as before.

We throw out the above rather as hints than anything else, to call attention to a subject that has not been as yet sufficiently discussed; we should rejoice to see the Editors of “Hymns Ancient and Modern” taking the matter into their earnest consideration.

ULRICH VON HUTTEN.

Ulrich von Hutten, Imperial Poet and Orator. Translated from Chauffour-Kestner's *Etudes sur les Réformateurs du 16me Siècle.* By ARCHIBALD YOUNG, Esq., Advocate. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1863.

THERE are some names which at once call up a vision of their possessors. We think at once of the men themselves, as we have beheld them in their writings, their portraits, and their actions. We cannot for a moment disconnect their words or deeds from the personal characteristics, the traits of feature and form which we have learned to attribute to them. Who could dissociate the rude pertinacity, the bluster, vulgarity, and self-assumption of Luther, from the coarse, sensual countenance, the bull-dog neck, the butcher-like form, which we see presented to us in his portrait? Who can read the witty colloquies, the elegant treatises, the satirical arguments, the temporising epistles of Erasmus, and not see before him the little, neat scholar, with his keen ferret eyes, his sarcastic mouth, his shrewd nose, his stoop, his cough, and his general appearance of weak health and infirm purpose?

Ulrich von Hutten, the knightly Reformer of the sixteenth century, might well be better known than he is in England. His personal characteristics are as distinct and remarkable as those of any among his more famous contemporaries; and there is no reason why his name should not evoke as clear a picture in the mind. If among the German nobles of that eventful period Fronsperg made himself conspicuous in military matters, and Sickingen in politics, Hutten stood forth as prominently in ecclesiastical affairs. Rash and turbulent he may indeed have been, but he had excuse in the magnitude of the forces against which he contended, and the supposed impracticability of any gradual reformation. To one of his character, with a fervid hatred of oppression, an ardent zeal for what he deemed the truth, and with the unchecked spirit of a mediæval noble burning in his breast, the appeal to the sword was the natural mode of pursuing his cause; and if the thought of the inexpediency of furthering religion by bloodshed ever crossed his mind (which indeed is unlikely), he calmed his scruples by laying the blame on the head of those who strove to crush religious freedom by force. Certainly, he contributed no little assistance to the work to which he had devoted his life. The writer of the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, and the *Trias Romana*, satires and invectives whose equals have never been seen in modern times, could not but exercise a gigantic power over the impressionable minds of that awakening era. And when to his writings in prose

and verse, which amount to not less than fifty separate publications, all more or less bearing on the Reformation, are added his sufferings, his military services, his deeds of daring for the same cause, we cannot but perceive that Hutten materially contributed to the progress of the Reformation, and deserves to meet with an able biographer in this country, which has hitherto been without a life of this very remarkable man.

The work of M. Chaffour-Kestner, a translation of which has been published by Mr. Young, is an interesting, though somewhat brief sketch of Hutten's life, conveying a fairly complete idea of the German knight and poet. And although, being written by a thorough partisan of the Reformers, it furnishes too bright a picture of the deeds and motives of the actors in that great drama, and omits to notice the darker side of the history, or to display the petty, merely human interests that swayed many of the foremost movers in that strife, yet will it amply repay study, and afford valuable help to any one who seeks to read for himself the oft-told, yet seldom understood, lesson of the Reformation.

Born amid the din of arms, in the ancestral castle of his family in Franconia, where war and the chase were the only occupations that offered themselves to his notice in the active lives of those around him, Hutten was by his father early destined for the monastery; and it was doubtless the reaction from this enforced asceticism that rendered him the innovator and revolutionist that he is deemed to have been. Flying from the Abbey of Fulda, in defiance of his father's commands, at the age of sixteen he betook himself to the ancient university of Cologne, where, in accordance with the scholastic system there pursued, he learned logic and dialectics, and obtained great practice in the use of arguments, which he afterwards wielded with terrible effect in his controversy with the obscurantists. But the dry bones of scholasticism did not long satisfy his ardent intellect. The "new learning" soon found in him an eager supporter, and before long he had so far advanced in classical lore as to be able to take the situation of Professor in the new university at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. This was in the year 1506. From that time till 1514 but little is known of his movements. The greater portion of the period was spent in travelling, according to the custom of German students, in order to complete his education. Wherever he went he left tokens of his presence in the verses which he composed upon the various accidents of his wanderings. Cheerful, careless, with no anxiety for the future, living on alms, repaying hospitality with a song or a dedication, now serving as a common soldier in Maximilian's army, now the guest of some magnificent Bishop, he learned many important and some bitter lessons during these eight years. He brought with him also the seeds of a shameful disease which he had contracted in his journeyings, and an experience of evil which

exercised a marked control over the view which he took of the events and the persons wherewith he was connected in after time. But he likewise perfected his knowledge of Greek and Latin, and became, if not an eminent, certainly a respectable scholar; the love of liberty had grown in him to a passion; he had a deep affection for his fatherland, and a hatred of oppression, whether it took the form of foreign rule or the jurisdiction of an alien Pontiff.

The cowardly murder of his cousin, Hans von Hutten, by the Duke of Wurtemberg, drew him suddenly into active life. Menaces, vituperations, passionate appeals, were used to obtain vengeance against the high-born assassin. Useless as were his orations to obtain immediate punishment on the offender (who compounded for immunity by a money payment), they showed Hutten to his country as a great and powerful writer, as a politician who would do good service to any cause which he espoused, as a bold supporter of justice and honour against the highest and noblest in the land. And when the obscurantist party made their famous attack upon Reuchlin, endeavouring to destroy the growing taste for classical and Hebrew lore by procuring the condemnation of its chief champion, men looked to Hutten to espouse the cause of the oppressed, and to do battle against the ignorant superstition that persecuted what it could not understand. Nor were their hopes disappointed. The *Triumphus Capnionis*, in which Reuchlin (Capnio) is represented as leading in triumph his vanquished enemies, who are treated with violent, almost brutal, abuse, was followed by the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, the most poignant, witty, true and telling satire, that the world had ever seen. Though not entirely composed by Hutten, it bears the mark of his hand throughout; and there can be no doubt that, if some portions were written by others, the design of the work and the greater part were owed to him. Soon after this circumstances led him to Rome. Unfitted by physical infirmities for the life of a soldier, revolting against the enforced confinement of a convent, he was, in the opinion of his relations, suited for nothing but the intrigues and quibbles of civil law. To please these friends he repaired to Italy, and studied under the most eminent masters, to qualify himself for a degree. Whatever advance he made in this science was qualified by the detestation with which he regarded the antiquated formulas in which it was conceived; and he soon turned his attention from the study of the schools to concentrate it on a searching investigation into the corruption and scandals that were conspicuous in the court and Church of Rome. Nothing else was gained from the sojourn in the imperial city but a firm conviction of the magnitude of the evils prevalent there, and a reputation for patriotism and courage which procured for him the honour of knighthood from the Emperor's hand, and the title of Imperial Poet and Orator.

Domesticated once more in his father's castle at Steckelberg, Hutten gave full scope to the indignation that filled his bosom at the miserable condition to which Latin Christianity had been reduced by the ambition of Popes and the secular counsels which governed the actions of most of the princes of the Church. A work of the bitter, carping, critic Laurentius Valla, on the Donation of Constantine, was disinterred from a convent library, and published by Hutten with an audacious dedication to Leo X. himself. This was long before Luther had fulminated his anathemas against the Court of Rome. Indeed the Reformer was himself only learning his lesson at the time that the knight was in the thick of the fight; and it is certain that Luther owed many of his views on the subject of the authority and jurisdiction of the Popes to Hutten's works.

The above publication was followed by the *Vadicus*, or *Trias Romana*, a dialogue in which is related what one of the interlocutors had been told concerning Rome, interspersed with observations from the other personages. Other works in a similar strain followed, all levelled against the temporal power of the Papacy and the violent repression of liberty of discussion, which our author considered as the inalienable right of a free people. Such language could not be overlooked at Rome. He was denounced; his writings were prohibited: and seeing no hope of obtaining a hearing for himself, he hastened to ally himself with Luther, who had by this time been hailed as the head of the Reformation in Germany. The discussion about Indulgences had appeared to Hutten formerly as merely a foolish "Monks' quarrel;" but he had learned now to see in it the germ of a mighty movement which might effect the design to which his life was consecrated. Influenced by this conviction, in 1520 he offered Luther an asylum with the brave knight Sickingen, should he meet with difficulties in prosecuting his great enterprise. It was not that Hutten agreed in all points with the monk of Wittemberg. Many of Luther's doctrines revolted his better sense, and seemed to him as far removed from Christian truth, as were the Papal pretensions against which his intellect and heart were alike enlisted. But he had greatness of soul to appreciate the Reformer's general utility to the cause he had at heart, and he knew that as regarded opposition to the rapacity, exactions, and corruptions of Rome, Luther was entirely one with himself. "I accept the title of Lutheran," he said, "that men may know that I am ever faithful to the cause of truth and liberty."

The idea of reform which had taken possession of Hutten's mind, was one which events proved to have been ill-founded. He deemed that by means of a combination between the Emperor, nobles, scholars, and burgesses of the great towns, a pacific reformation of the Church might be accomplished, and a national Church be formed upon the ruins of the Papal system. Into the minutiae of doctrines he did not enter. Provided he could libe-

rate his beloved country from the intolerable yoke of a foreign prelate, and repress the scandals (such as indulgences, and the criminal lives of religious, &c.) which degraded the name of Christianity, he was content to leave other improvements to time and the good sense of rulers in Church and State. These views he put forth unflinchingly in numerous works. No threats or danger could deter him from stating his opinions, and urging them upon those who could give effect to them. Even when he himself was placed under the ban of the Empire, and when the condemnation of Luther at the diet of Worms rendered the enunciation of such views more than ordinarily perilous, he held to the same course, flooding Germany with letters, dialogues, poems, pamphlets, now no longer written in a dead language, but in the vernacular, and thus appealing to a new class of readers, who at the same moment learned their own strength and how to employ it practically. In vain did Charles V. endeavour to seduce Hutten by arguments and promises from his allegiance to the Reformers. He only drew the bonds of union closer. Seeing that it was useless to hope to attach the Emperor to their cause, the nobles banded together in defence of their common interests imperilled by the usurpations of prelates and princes. Their plans failed: the brave Sickingen fell; Hutten and his companion Œcolampadius fled for their lives to Switzerland. Here, while some warmly welcomed him, others kept aloof from him. Among the latter was Erasmus, whose conduct was owing not simply to the natural timidity of his nature, but to the personal offence which he had received from the rude, though well-meaning knight. Driven from Mulhausen by persecution, Hutten retired to Zurich, and in this neighbourhood, in the utmost destitution, he breathed his last, on the 29th August, 1524, being then but thirty-six years old.

Thus departed a bold, pure champion for the truth, as he believed it; a devoted friend, a stern enemy, unstained with avarice or self-seeking; one who fought and laboured for the human side of the Reformation, whose hatred of tyranny was as the air he breathed, whose love of liberty was deep and strong as death. No writer has more courageously lashed the vices and failings of ecclesiastical rulers; none did more to popularise the idea of the Reformation, and to make the masses comprehend the prospects of the coming struggle and their own importance in the contest. For these reasons Hutten will ever be venerated by politicians, if not altogether by Churchmen.

LETTER FROM THE REVIEWER OF "STUART ON LOW MASSES."

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

DEAR SIR,—I have just now received by post the printed letter addressed to you by Mr. Stuart in reply to my review of his pamphlet "On Low Masses" in the last *Ecclesiastic*. It admits of an easy and complete rejoinder on all the points he touches in reply.

1. I said in the review, "Mr. Stuart *asserts* that, prior to the Reformation, Low Masses had drawn crowds of worshippers to our churches on week days as well as Sundays. We challenge him to produce *historical authority* for his assertion." Mr. Stuart answers confidently, "I accept the challenge;" and, by way of "historical authority," proceeds to quote "the remains of side altars and side chapels" in our old churches, adding, "I conclude that these were built *with a purpose*, and that this purpose was the same as that for which I see side chapels and side altars still used in Roman Catholic countries. And as I see that in Roman Catholic countries crowds of people do now attend the daily Masses, *I think it only reasonable to conclude that the same results followed here in England*, when the same system of worship prevailed here."

And this extraordinary piece of logic Mr. Stuart has the boldness to compare with Paley's argument of the watch in proof of design, and with the conclusions of natural theology drawn from the universe for the existence of a God! It appears to me rather like the proof of the doctor's apprentice in the old story, that his patient had eaten a horse because he saw the saddle and bridle under the bed. The "*purpose*" surely for which these "side chapels and side altars" were built both here and on the Continent, was not, as he supposes, to attract crowds of worshippers, but for *private* Masses to be said daily on behalf of the founders' souls. It is the common remark of travellers in Roman Catholic countries, that the Masses said at many of them are unattended by any worshippers, being deserted for a few which, for different reasons, may be more or less popular. But an illogical inference of *fact* from a hypothetical *purpose* is, in no sense, "*historical authority*;" nor is it a conclusion which satisfies my reason. That it does satisfy Mr. Stuart's, only disappoints my previous estimate of his logical ability. What I ask for is direct contemporary testimony that, prior to the Reformation, Low Masses did, in point of fact, draw crowds of worshippers to our churches on week days as well as on Sundays. Until such is produced my challenge is unanswered.

Though even supposing that *they did*, the fact really does not touch my argument; which is, that our *present* social habits and

other causes stated by me in the review do not allow of a fair comparison between ourselves and foreigners, or ourselves in former ages, with regard to religious practices ; and that we have no right to infer that the same results would follow, if the same opportunities were now given.

2. Mr. Stuart questions my comparison of "social habits," and alleges the Belgians in contradiction of it. I have lived in Belgium for eight months together, and my opinion is that their business habits do not interfere with their religious duties, especially the duty of attending public worship, as ours do. I expressly (in the review) refused to defend our national habit of incessant hard work ; but, as a matter of fact, the number of religious holidays which the brave Belgians enjoy in a very secular manner, "are such as in this country we should, rightly or wrongly, stigmatize as idle."

3. What I said was, that the question between us on this point was easily solved by the crucial test of experiment. There is no law that I am aware of to prevent Mr. Stuart putting his theory in practice, except that which requires a minimum number of communicants ; which, if his theory be worth anything, could not stand in the way. This *argumentum ad hominem* he reprobates as "inconsistent." I can only say that I *wish* his theory were practicable, and should be truly glad to see him prove it. For three years I once served in a church where the Daily Sacrifice was and is daily celebrated, and that under circumstances most favourable to success. Two or three, seldom a dozen, worshippers (not parishioners) attended, and *fewer* than at the subsequent Morning Prayer. A note at the end of the review which Mr. Stuart does not notice, stated this to be the result of experiment in the most popular churches of London and elsewhere.

4. With regard to the applicability of the Divine proverb of "casting pearls before swine," I can only say that I meant reverently to use it as I think it was originally used against the danger of profanation in forcing novel practices in religion, however holy, indiscriminately and unreservedly, upon unprepared minds. Our LORD uses it (S. Matt. vii. 6) with reference to His own creatures, and His own brethren in the flesh, and fellow religionists, the Jews. My intention simply was to protest against the possibility of such a scene as is described (for example) by Mr. Allies in his "Journal in France in 1845 and 1848," when he attended a Mass for the Dead at the church of S. Quentin, "and could not avoid noticing with what indifference most of the attendants on the funeral treated the holiest rite of the Church ; they were no doubt unbelievers ; and some ragged boys close beside me were a serious annoyance, incessantly spitting, laughing, and talking." (P. 102.)

5. I have been misinformed if something more than mere *moral* suasion has never been used at S. Mary Magdalene's to coerce the

presence of non-communicants at the celebration ; and I alluded to this in the phrase objected to, "physical compulsion." I most readily apologise for and withdraw the phrase, if I now rightly understand Mr. Stuart to disclaim, on behalf of himself and church-officers, (of course he does not mean to say that he does not compel his school-children¹ to attend,) having ever gone beyond "the sweet compulsion" spoken of by Hooker in a passage so appropriate that I will quote it.

"If they require at Communions frequency, we wish the same, knowing how acceptable unto God such service is when multitudes cheerfully concur unto it ; if they encourage men thereunto, we also (themselves acknowledge it) are not utterly forgetful to do the like ; if they require some public coercion for remedy of that wherein by milder and softer means little good is done, they know our laws and statutes provided in that behalf, whereunto whatsoever convenient help may be added more by the wisdom of men, what cause have we given the world to think that we are not ready to hearken to it, and to use any good mean of *sweet compulsion* to have this high and heavenly banquet largely furnished?"—(*Eccles. Pol.*, Book v. c. lxviii. 10.)

6. Mr. Stuart speaks as if any one taking a different view or line of action from himself in this matter, must feel less true compassion for those "thousands and tens of thousands" whom he describes as being swept down around us by death, "without having ever received God's own pledge of love." I do not "shrink from poverty like the plague," and I did not write the review "in a library chair and well furnished drawing-room," or under any circumstances, I dare say, much more self-indulgent than his own when he wrote the pamphlet. But the question is "whether the multiplication of low masses" is beginning at the right end, whether it is the wisest plan for reclaiming these lost multitudes, whether if the offer were made, they would be more likely to accept it than they now do the invitation where it is given, to attend the Daily Morning Prayer ; whether if they did accept it without some preparatory discipline, it would be the blessing he intends ? He has no right however to cast offensive personal reflections upon those who conscientiously adopt a more reserved and discreet method than his own, as if they were therefore necessarily less earnest, and more lukewarm in the work of saving souls.

7. Least of all, as I consider, does he succeed in justifying his conduct towards the Incumbent of the church which was the first, I believe, to restore, first the weekly, then the daily celebration, and was *facile princeps* in the use of an advanced catholic Eucharistic ritual. He "was told that Mr. Richards had preached a sermon at Margaret Street—which was pointed plainly and unequivocally against" him. "I then wrote privately to Mr. Richards,

¹ The only time I was ever present at "Low Mass" at S. Mary Magdalene, the congregation, I think, consisted of six adults, and about two hundred school-children.

who denied having intended anything of the kind." One would have thought that a disclaimer so absolute, coming from a person of such a character, might have satisfied any mere personal grievance. But no, Mr. Stuart proceeds to dictate the proper course of Mr. Richards' conduct, "I asked him—to give some *public* explanation of the matter, either to publish the sermon itself, or to preach another explanatory of it, or to write a line in some Church periodical (I suggested the *Guardian*)." Mr. Richards, with characteristic wisdom and modesty, not liking to appear in print, or to introduce mere paltry personal considerations into a sermon, of course "declined to do either of these things, or to give *any* public explanation of the matter,"—in which he had already assured Mr. Stuart he was altogether innocent of a personal intention. Mr. Stuart then admits that he put on the screw of threatening to publish a confidential correspondence; which he had about as much right to do as Mr. Shutte had to publish the private letters of the Bishop of Exeter. Mr. Richards naturally, as the Bishop did, protested against this breach of courtesy and confidence. And the result was that Mr. Stuart printed his "Letter" to Mr. Richards, being, as I conceive, altogether in the wrong from the beginning to the end of the whole business.

8. What was said about the "rule of worship" prescribed at present in the Prayer Book, and Mr. Stuart's proposed new rubrics, was this: that the new rule would not be more "*definite*" or *obligatory* than the present one; people would be no more *bound* to obey the one than the other; unless, indeed, *compelled* by law to do so under penalty, or (what Mr. Stuart disclaims) by private confession and discipline. There is no reason for concluding that the new rule would be less inoperative and impracticable than the present one. The obligation of both must be moral, and *in foro conscientie* only.

9. I should scarcely notice the carping exposure of alleged false prosody in a Latin proverb, which it was plain, from the circumstance of my altering the first word, I intended just to adapt to my own purpose, because it does not scan upon the fingers. The artifice is too much like the well-known policy of the advocate who has a bad cause. And I think that Mr. Stuart would have done far better to address himself to those other difficulties which I had suggested in the way of his system, not by any means for the sake of fault-finding, but because I believe that very important interests are at stake, and that the counsel of the Spirit in the Apocalypse is wiser than his—"Hold fast that thou hast."

I remain, &c.

THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW ON
"STUART ON LOW MASSES."

P.S.—There is an *erratum* in the article which I should like to see corrected, viz., at p. 439, to the sentence, "We are only fearful

of too impetuously abandoning the vantage ground which, in God's Providence guiding the religious revival of the last thirty years, has been attained among us, for what may seem better and higher, but which we shall certainly fail to reach"—add the words "*per saltum*." I did not intend to preclude the possibility of eventually reaching it, as the previous and next sentence shows; but the probability of reaching it by a *coup de main* and *bouleversement* of our present system.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Archdeacon SINCLAIR'S *Two Charges*, entitled *Reason and Faith*, (Mackintosh) show a considerable amount of miscellaneous reading, ranging from the classics, through the early Fathers, to the Scotch metaphysical writers of the last century. The general subject of the Charge, it will be at once inferred, is a stricture upon "Essays and Reviews."

How should we Treat our Servants? (Mozley) is a tract intended for masters and mistresses, and will be found very helpful in what all feel to be a most difficult duty.

Mr. EDMUND JAMES SMITH, who, we presume, is an employé in the office of the Ecclesiastical Commission, has published *Two Letters*, (Rivingtons) addressed by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury, concerning the origin and doings of that Board. The Commission has not many friends. It is all the more needful, therefore, that this short summary of the proceedings should be made generally accessible. The chief charge which has been brought against it, is undoubtedly the costliness of its machinery. Mr. Smith makes a calculation, which, if accurate, will enable persons to estimate how far such a charge can be sustained. He calculates that thirty shillings has been expended for every hundred pounds that has passed through the hands of the Commission, "including the stamp duty on purchases, and the costs incurred, when negotiations with lessees have not terminated in agreements."

The Origin and Composition of the Roman Liturgy, and its Difference from that of the Orthodox Church, by IVAN BOROVNITSKY, translated by BASIL POPOFF, (Masters: London,) is a work of very peculiar value, in more ways than one. It gives a novel sensation, to find ourselves looking at the West, from the Eastern point of view; and accustomed as we are to the sweeping assumptions of the Roman Church, it is as interesting as it is strange, to listen to the counter claims of a Church, which looks on the Latin Branch, as a mother on a young and erring daughter, and talks with a sort of contemptuous pity of the extent to which it differs from the "Universal Orthodox Church." Many differences are noted in this work; but the most important are, that the Church of Rome denies the cup to the laity, refuses the Sacrament altogether to children, and attributes the change in the Elements to the Dominical words, and not to the invocation of the HOLY GHOST for that purpose.

"*Will ye also go away ?*" (Palmer,) is the title of a nice little tract, intended to promote the same object as Mr. Stuart's "*Low Masses*," but beginning really at the right end, by pressing the duty and privilege of assisting at celebration, when they do not intend to communicate, on the more devout portions of our congregations.

Dr. GODFRAY has translated the three learned Letters of "Philethes," (query, Canon Wordsworth,) which have been already widely circulated in Italy, into French. We certainly cannot approve of all that is done by the Anglo-Continental Society; but in the present disorganized state of the Italian Church, it may be well for both parties to be reminded of those principles, which were recognized in the early ages. The pamphlet is entitled "*Du Confit entre le Pape et l'Italie*," and seems, therefore, to assume a little too much. It is published by Rivingtons.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The following letters will explain themselves.

October 1, 1863.

SIR,—You have admitted into the October number of the *Ecclesiastic*, page 478, one of the worst slanders I can remember, by an anonymous hand, without a word of reference to the denial and exposure of that slander, published under my hand. This obliges me to request that you will take my name off the list of subscribers to the *Ecclesiastic*, and further, that you will make public in your November number, my reason for this request.

Your obedient servant,
GEORGE A. DENISON.

33, Aldersgate Street.

SIR,—I have received a letter from you, complaining in rather strong language of an article in the last *Ecclesiastic*. Your letter is now in the hands of the author of the article referred to, and will be printed (as you wish) in the next Number, together with the writer's reply. I will only now say, that I feel sure he will be most willing to express regret, if he has inadvertently made an inaccurate statement. I had not myself seen the *Guardian*, and did not know what the parish alluded to was. "Slander," certainly there can be none. The force of the writer's argument does not really depend on the fact, whether *many persons* did not see, or *one person* did see anything wrong in a particular assemblage, but on the ascertained liabilities of men and women in the lower classes, when they meet in large numbers, to transgress the rules of moderation and modesty.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,
THE EDITOR OF THE ECCLESIASTIC.

P.S.—Any communication respecting the sale of the *Ecclesiastic*, should be addressed to the Publisher.

MY DEAR SIR,—I cannot bring myself to think that any apology is due to Archdeacon Denison, for the passage of my article, which he

refers to. No charge whatever, direct or implied, is made against himself. A simple matter of fact is stated thus:—the author's own opinion, that crowded harvest homes lead to immorality, is corroborated by a correspondent of the *Guardian*, who alleges the actual fact in a well-known instance. It is true, that the writer of the letter is anonymous; but he is known to the Editor of the *Guardian*, and the admission of his letter is a guarantee of credibility. This is no injurious reflection upon the Archdeacon or upon his parish. No one doubts that he would use every precaution to prevent any abuse, and the vicious tendencies of such festivities. But with my experience of country people, not small, nor limited to a single neighbourhood, I should consider it a perfect miracle if such a number of both sexes could meet together under such exciting circumstances, and disperse at night, without the scandal alleged. The most the Archdeacon can reasonably do, is to deny his knowledge of any actual crime ensuing. This negative testimony would not satisfy my conviction; for it so happens, that in the other instance of an over-crowded harvest celebration, which the article mentions in connexion with the one in question, and where I was accompanied by the squire of my parish, we were told by one of the farmers, that though cases of drunkenness occasionally occurred, they always managed to keep them out of sight, and unknown to the presiding clergy.

I can see no good reason why the Archdeacon should take offence. I am often told that the opportunity afforded by our Sunday evening service is abused to vicious purposes, but I should hardly call this "slander," though I know no special instance. Nay, I fear that it may be too true—and I would only still keep on the service, because I think the blessings of it preponderate over the evils. I do not doubt that his great harvest meetings have been a principal cause of recommending the practice generally, which a mere parochial festival would hardly have done. This has been their true merit,—and now they have done that good work, I agree with himself in hoping they may subside into parochial dimensions.

Yours, &c.,

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE ON
HARVEST CELEBRATIONS.

P.S.—I cannot now recollect whether I had seen the Archdeacon's letter to the *Guardian*, when I wrote the article, or not. However, the impression it left on my mind, *when I saw it*, was, that it contained no specific denial of the substantial truth of the charges, brought by the "Forty Shilling Freeholder," but called him a slanderer and a clergyman, (which latter imputation, at least, was declared to be erroneous by the *Guardian*;) while another letter subsequently written by the Archdeacon to the bench of magistrates, appeared implicitly to admit some of the irregularities complained of, but excused them as those of non-parishioners present at the festival, over whom he had no control, and for whom he was not answerable. This was the very ground on which I objected to *large* gatherings.

MR. AITKEN'S THEORY OF JUSTIFICATION.

The Prayer Book unveiled in the Light of Christ ; or, Unity without Liturgical Revision. Letters for Nonconformists, expository of the Church's Teaching, &c., addressed to the Rev. T. Binney. By the Rev. R. AITKEN, Incumbent of Pendeen, Cornwall, and Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Lichfield. London : William Macintosh.

If unity could be obtained at any price short of a surrender of the Church's Faith, we would be the first to welcome the proposal. We are too conscious that the shortcomings of our Clergy have tended in times past to swell the ranks of Dissenting bodies to look around us with any other feelings than a hearty desire that those who walk not with us might be won back by gentleness to the unity of the Church. We cannot see the zeal and earnestness which they so often display, without a wish that all this uncontrolled energy might be devoted to the service of the Church. But whilst we desire unity, faith has higher claims, and therefore it is with some regret that we lay down Mr. Aitken's proposals of reconciliation, with the conviction that they are altogether untenable.

Mr. Aitken's peculiar views of conversion are the substratum of his entire argument ; but whilst in this respect his doctrine may be identical with that of Mr. Binney, and his co-religionists, we doubt much whether they will be accepted by anyone as a sufficient basis for an agreement. But even so, Mr. Aitken's testimony to the higher life, in which the Church educates her children, may create a desire for something better than the meeting-house affords, and may lead some candid minds to reconsider the claims of the Church. More than this we cannot venture to hope, because the whole structure of the argument is based on an unsound postulate. This basis being taken for granted, the superstructure has much that is specious and inviting ; but when the groundwork is removed, the building must inevitably fall to the earth. It is all the more specious on account of its unsoundness ; since a construction of human invention is more easily comprehended by a finite mind, than the truths which emanate from the Fountain of All Wisdom.

The task to which Mr. Aitken applies himself, is a reconciliation between the popular doctrine of Justification by faith and the teaching of the Church respecting Regeneration. To be in CHRIST for justification, and CHRIST to be in us for regeneration are two distinct things, which, Mr. Aitken says, are ordinarily confounded. Dissenters and Evangelicals confound justification with regeneration, while Churchmen link it with sacramental

grace. The former are content with bare acceptance with God, without seeking a regenerate life; while the latter look for regeneration when they have sought or obtained justification. In the case of adult baptism—which Mr. Aitken considers to have been the normal condition of the Church—justification preceded baptism, which was its external seal; but the real use of baptism was not the cleansing of sin, which had taken place before, but the burial of the old man and the raising up of the new creature. Whilst justification was an act of pardon once performed, regeneration was a state of life into which the Christian was introduced at baptism; and this state was the consequence of CHRIST dwelling in the Christian for sanctification. Man's regenerate state was therefore one of higher dignity than his justification. To call men to justification was the first work of the preachers of the Gospel; but then came the higher duties of building up believers in the faith, and teaching them to live the life of the regenerate. Justification was but a negative work, the remission of sins; but the regeneration which followed was positive, for it was the participation in the Divine Nature of our LORD, and His life within producing the fruits of holiness and love. Both were in their order necessary, but the last was an addition to the first. In laying down that the work of Evangelicals and Dissenters has been to preach justification, whilst the higher task of training men in the regenerate life is the aim of Churchmen, it is manifest that the former have nothing to surrender in allowing the teaching of the latter; and that, therefore, in the acceptance of Mr. Aitken's theory, the true grounds of reconciliation may be found.

But then the difficulty of infant baptism comes in the way, for since Evangelicals and Dissenters deny justification to the baptized, as such, it is manifest that justification does not precede baptism in Christians who have been baptized in their infancy. Justification, according to Mr. Aitken's theory, is a sensible experience of acceptance with God, given at some particular time, and those who have not passed through this experience, are called unconverted Christians.

"Before we are converted, we are not reconciled with God, and therefore we are not in a position to enter into covenant with Him, or to be made the living members of the Church, which is His Body. The mere act of baptism will not make us so, unless we are previously in a state of justification."—P. 133.

"I have, therefore, often said in the course of this exposition, and I say it again, both to Churchmen and Evangelicals, that justification has nothing whatever to do with baptism, saving only that by baptism the blessings, powers, and benefits of justification, are confirmed and sealed unto the justified by the Christian sacrament, and that when the baptized child is justified, he has the full advantage of the same efficacious sealing, as if he had not been baptized until he was justified."—P. 154.

Theirs is a provision state, like that of the Apostles during the time which intervened between our LORD's ascension and the Day of Pentecost. The Apostles had received their commission, but waited for the HOLY SPIRIT's advent, before they commenced its exercise.

"It is only in the light of this self-same provisional principle of the Divine government, that we shall be able fully to understand the real spiritual condition of our baptized infants; who are brought to CHRIST and are pardoned; and who have also a measure of the Spirit's leadings, preventings, and influence, suitable to their provisional state, that the preparatory work for their regeneration may be successfully carried on; and yet the strait gate of justification is still before them, and through which they must pass before CHRIST can be formed in them, or the life of CHRIST be manifested in them."—P. 163.

Now, it will be seen that according to this theory, baptism is neither justification nor regeneration. It is but a provisional rite, which must be followed by justification and regeneration, and is the means of conveying no spiritual, but only outward and temporal blessings, except in the case of those, who die before the commission of actual sin; and then we should like to ask Mr. Aitken when their justification takes place, or whether they can enter into God's presence without it. Truly for them there has been no strait gate to be passed, but they have entered within the vail, without a struggle with sin, and without any consciousness of guilt. Our LORD's words respecting the strait gate were not spoken to children, but to men who were to endure great things for His sake; and there is nothing in them which connects them more with justification, than with any other grace, after which we must strive with unceasing perseverance. A man baptized in infancy, however pure and devout his life may be, is numbered with the unconverted until he experiences these certain strivings after acceptance with God, which are all of one formal type. The acquirement of this favour, so earnestly sought, is the highest point to which Evangelical teaching ordinarily reaches. The sinner now has found himself in CHRIST for justification, and then comes in, and not until then, the utility of the Churchman's teaching, that we must find CHRIST in us for sanctification, and the result of this will be a holy and self-denying life, framed after the fashion of our SAVIOUR's.

With the practical consequences of this teaching we have little to do, for this at the best is an uncertain test of truth, yet we cannot but by the way observe, that whilst men of one class of mind, might be led to rest with too much confidence on the persuasion that they have received once for all the gift of justification, others would be continually perplexed with the doubt whether they had ever been accepted in God's sight, because they had not experienced exactly the same feelings, which Mr. Aitken appears to have invariably found in all his converts. It is, therefore, as well

for the sake of these doubting Christians, as for the great cause of truth, that we set the Church's doctrine of justification against Mr. Aitken's theory. For this purpose, we submit three propositions, which it will be our endeavour to prove :

I. That justification takes place at baptism.

II. That justification is not one act, but a state of life in which we are maintained by God's grace.

III. That justification cannot be unaccompanied by sanctification.

I. Mr. Aitken holds that, in the case of adults, justification takes place before baptism, and in that of infants at some subsequent period. We must suppose, that as an English Churchman, he accepts the definition of justification given in the XIth Article, in which we read,

"We are accounted righteous before GOD, only for the merits of our LORD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; therefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

In this homily, which is entitled the Homily of the Salvation of Mankind, we read,

"Insomuch that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to GOD's favour, and made His children, and inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven; and they, which in act or deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to GOD unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin, that shall be imputed to their damnation. This is that justification of righteousness, which S. Paul speaketh of, when he saith, 'No man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in JESUS CHRIST.'"

In these words, it is asserted so distinctly as to leave no doubt on the minds of the framers of our articles and homilies, that at baptism infants receive the first gift of justification. To be accounted righteous before GOD, and to have our sins forgiven, are correlative terms, and if justification is another name for the first, it must be so for the latter also. Mr. Aitken asserts that baptized infants are not in CHRIST for justification, and yet he does not deny that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, and that they are forgiven and accepted; but how they can be forgiven and accepted except for the merits of our LORD's atonement, which is justification, we cannot understand. In the Baptismal Office, the reference to justification pervades the whole, and is in strict conformity with the "Homily of the Salvation of Mankind;" "We beseech Thee for Thine infinite mercies, that Thou wilt mercifully look upon this child, *wash him* and sanctify him with the HOLY GHOST, that he being *delivered from Thy wrath*, may be received into the 'ark of CHRIST's

Church ;" and again, " we call upon Thee for this infant, that he coming to Thy holy baptism, may receive *remission of his sins*, by spiritual regeneration."

That justification is to be obtained by faith, of which infants are not capable, is apparently the reason why Mr. Aitken denies justification to baptized infants. We are justified by faith *only*, but the word "only" excludes not God's grace, but all other works and qualities in man. Faith in itself can effect nothing, or else the work would be not God's, but our own. Faith is the ordinary instrument of reception, and therefore in the Catechism it is laid down as necessary as well for baptism as for Holy Communion, but where faith is of necessity wanting, as in the case of infants, we do not deny the grace of justification. The paralytic man, who was let down through the roof, was healed, and yet he exercised no faith. The children who were brought to CHRIST, received His blessing, and yet they were incapable of faith, and if we deny justification to infants, we must deny all other tokens of God's favour, since the pardon of sin lies at the foundation of them all.

If baptism has reference only to the renovation of life, how does Mr. Aitken explain the article of the Nicene Creed, " One baptism for the remission of sins ?" and there is scarcely a passage of Scripture in which baptism is mentioned, which does not altogether contradict Mr. Aitken's assertion. Waterland, in his " Summary View of the doctrine of Justification," has very clearly and concisely examined the chief of these texts, in order to prove that baptism is " the outward mean and instrument of justification, and the immediate and proximate form and rite of conveyance." We are surprised that the arguments of so well-known a divine are never once alluded to by Mr. Aitken ; but before he publishes a second edition of his letters, we would advise him to read and carefully consider the weight which is due to them. " He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." If the word saved is equivalent to justified, since it is opposed to condemned, it is manifest that the believing must be understood of a lively faith ; and yet this alone is not said to save or justify without the addition of baptism. If justification by faith only is understood as excluding everything else on man's part, and not as relating to that which is done by God, Who uses baptism as His instrument, we see no difficulty in harmonizing the doctrine of sacramental grace with that of justification by faith, which seems to be the dominant idea in the minds of Evangelicals and Dissenters.

To the same effect speak the words of S. Peter, " Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the Name of JESUS CHRIST, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the HOLY GHOST." Although true repentance is God's gift, and therefore implies faith and grace, yet Baptism was to be received in order to obtain remission of sins, i.e., justification, and the reception of the HOLY

GHOST. S. Paul, again, when he was converted became a true believer from the time when he said, "LORD, what wilt Thou have me to do?" and yet three days passed before Ananias came in unto him, and said, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." If he had been already justified these would have been unmeaning words; but, if they have any signification at all, they make it evident that his sin remained for three days while he waited in penitential sorrow, until through baptism he received the grace of justification. To notice all the passages of Scripture, which bear on this point, would involve the expansion of our remarks into a treatise; but there are two which we cannot pass over. The first is, Eph. v. 25, 26, "CHRIST also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and *cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word,*" i.e., according to the interpretation of S. Chrysostom, by the words used in the form of baptism. The same statement is emphatically repeated by S. Paul: Coloss. ii. 12, 13; Titus iii. 5, 6, 7; Heb. x. 21, 22, 23. The other text we quote is one cited by Waterland, as winding up the Scripture doctrine on this head. It is 1 Cor. vi. 11; "Such were some of you, but ye were washed (*ἀπελούσαθε*, viz. in baptism,) but ye were sanctified, (*ἡγιασθητε*), but ye were justified (*δικαιώθητε*), in the Name of the LORD JESUS, and by the Spirit of our God." The three concurrent causes of justification (together with sanctification), are here mentioned together, i.e., the meritorious cause, the LORD JESUS; the efficient or operating cause, the Spirit of our God; and the instrumental rite of conveyance, baptism. And the testimony of the Fathers is in universal agreement with the plain interpretation of these several texts of Scripture. Although they speak little of justification as distinguished from sanctification—for they did not divide in idea things which in reality are united—they spoke of the baptized descending into the water laden with their sins, and ascending from thence pardoned and cleansed. The same idea continually occurs as that expressed in our Catechism: "Born in sin, the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace." S. Augustine's words are a summary of our own, as well as of the Church's faith, "Ecce enim baptizati homines, omnia illis peccata dimissa sunt, justificati sunt a peccatis." (Serm. clviii., de verb. Apostol. Rom. viii.) With all this evidence before us, it is manifest that Mr. Aitken must give some new definition of justification, unknown to the Church, which however he does not do, before he can substantiate the statement that baptism has nothing to do with justification.

II. Mr. Aitken has been misled by the supposition that justification is an act which takes place but once in a man's life. He has rightly regarded Regeneration as a state of life in which we must be maintained by God's grace, but why should he not view justification in the same light? There may be times when a penitent feels a sense of acceptance with God as he never felt it before, and

it may be profitable to awaken men to repentance that they may experience this peace of mind, but this is very different from asserting that justification is one solitary act. If it were, what hope would there be for those who fall away if justification once obtained could never be renewed? The Homily of the Salvation of Mankind is explicit on this point. "They which in act or deed do sin after their baptism, when they turn again to God, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins in such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation." This occurs immediately after the statement that infants being baptized are washed from their sins; and who shall restrict the power of God's grace? If the Christian must not limit his forgiveness, although his brother sin against him seventy times seven times and turn again and repent, can we think that God will be less merciful than man? If so, the returning sinner as oft as he repents may claim the renewal of his justification. All the offices of the Church are framed on the supposition that he will. In Baptism first our sins are washed away, but in the daily service we make confession of the sins which we have since committed, and the message of absolution assures us that "God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel," and what is this pardon but the renewal of justification? The prayer which our LORD has taught us, "Forgive us our trespasses," if it be for constant use, speaks to the same effect. In the Communion Office, again, confession is made, and we seek again the blessing of absolution; and if this were not enough, in the prayer of humble access, we ask for nothing less than justification, when we pray, "Grant us, therefore, gracious LORD, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear SON and so to drink His blood, *that our sinful bodies may be made clean through His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood.*" The order for the Visitation of the Sick is framed upon the same principle. Not only does the absolution proclaim forgiveness of sins, but in the very ancient prayer that follows, the priest thus supplicates for the sick person: "Open Thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgiveness. Renew in him, most loving FATHER, whatsoever hath been decayed by the fraud and malice of the devil, or by his own carnal will and frailness . . . and, forasmuch as he putteth his full trust in Thy mercy, *impute not unto him his former sins;*" and in the Commendatory Prayer for a sick person at the point of departure: "We humbly commend the soul of this Thy servant, our dear brother, into Thy hands, as into the hands of a faithful Creator, and most merciful SAVIOUR; most humbly beseeching Thee, that it may be precious in Thy sight. *Wash it, we pray Thee, in the blood of that immaculate Lamb,* that was slain to take away the sins of the world, that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted in the midst of this miserable and naughty world,

through the lusts of the flesh or the wiles of Satan, *being purged and done away, it may be presented pure and without spot before Thee.*"

We conclude, therefore, that justification is a state of favour with God into which we are admitted at Baptism, but which needs to be continually renewed as often as we sin. The justification of Abraham was not a single act. He was justified when he received the promise of a son, and his belief was imputed unto him for righteousness, but he was justified again when he offered up Isaac. His last justification was a fulfilment and increase of the first. Many years had intervened, and he had been maintained in a state of justification, which had been increased by each act of faith by which he pleased God. S. Paul again declares, "Whom God called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified." (Rom. viii. 30.) And why is justification only mentioned between our calling and our glorification, but because the work of justification is being continually renewed. The Psalms are not the expressions of an unconverted man, but of one who has drunk deeply of the wells of salvation, and yet throughout them all, we find ardent prayers for pardon and earnest longings for justification. This is the spirit which they breathe, "Cleanse Thou me from my secret faults, for who can tell how oft he offendeth?"

The greatest of God's saints even to the very end of their course have felt their need of God's justifying grace. They have never viewed it as an act performed on God's part once for all, at a time long passed away, but as a grace of which they sought the constant renewing. S. Augustine, we are told, was wont to say that from Baptism even esteemed Christians and Bishops ought not to depart out of the body without a worthy and competent course of penitence. And in such acts, his biographer tells us, his last hours were spent, for he had the penitential psalms written out, and whilst lying on his bed, he used in the days of his sickness to look on the squares, placed against the wall, and read and wept largely and continually, and that these penitential exercises might not be hindered, about ten days before his departure, he requested that no one might be allowed to come in to him, except at those times when the physician visited him, or when refreshment was brought to him. His injunctions were observed, and all that time he gave himself continually to prayer. And where is the humble Christian, who, in the hour of death, could rest on an assurance of justification once felt, instead of seeking again that his sins may be put away for the merits of his LORD's atonement. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," but not the less do we deceive ourselves, if, whilst we are in the flesh, we vainly fancy that we have no more need of being justified through our SAVIOUR's merits.

III. We must now proceed to consider the third answer to Mr. Aitken's argument. Justification is never unaccompanied by sanctification. Mr. Aitken distinguishes between our being in CHRIST for justification, and CHRIST being in us for sanctification, complaining that Dissenters and Evangelicals are content with the former without going on to the latter. Sanctification in his view is a grace, which succeeds justification, and must be sought after this is obtained, but what we shall endeavour to show is, that the one cannot be unaccompanied by the other. They may be divided in thought, but not in act, and if this had been always borne in mind, the Church would have been spared the controversies by which she has been divided on this point. We have treated justification in its forensic sense, limiting it to the forgiveness of sins, both because we wish to meet Mr. Aitken, by using his terms in the same sense as he does, and also because amongst the divines of our own Church, as Hooker, Bull, Barrow, and Waterland, it has been commonly so applied; but yet we must remember that before any controversy on justification arose, the Fathers commonly spoke of the justified man as just, not only by the pardon of his sins, but by the infusion of righteousness. The one is negative, and the other positive, but our offices connect them together, since one without the other would not avail for salvation. In baptism we pray, not only, "*wash him*," but also "*sanctify him* with the HOLY GHOST;" and in the daily absolution after the declaration of pardon, we are exhorted to pray, "that GOD will grant us true repentance and *His Holy Spirit*, that those things may please Him, which we do at this present." In the Holy Communion we pray not only that *we may dwell in Christ*, (i.e. according to Mr. Aitken, for justification); but that *Christ may dwell* in us, (i.e., for sanctification), and again in the last office for the sick, "impute not to him his former sins, but *strengthen him with Thy Blessed Spirit*."

The schoolmen were probably the first to distinguish the forgiveness of sin from the infusion of righteousness, and therefore Hooker, whose mind was formed on the scholastic model, asserts that righteousness is imputed in justification but imparted in sanctification. The Council of Trent, joining together that which, being inseparable in act, was not to be distinguished in thought, declared that "justification is not only remission of sins, but sanctification also, and has five causes; the final, God's glory and eternal life; the efficient, GOD; the meritorious, CHRIST; the instrumental, the sacraments; and the formal, righteousness, given by GOD, received according to the good pleasure of the HOLY GHOST, and according to the disposition of the receiver, receiving together with the remission of sins, faith, hope and charity." There is little cause for controversy here, if we consider the inseparable union between justification and sanctification, as both flowing from our regeneration. Even Hooker allows that we are agreed with the Church of Rome

in the foundation, which is the merits of CHRIST'S Atonement; but our controversy with Rome has rather been on the nature of that faith which is necessary to justification, and even here, we think, that the discussion has rather been a war of words than any real and essential difference. Our homily, to which reference must again be made, says, "S. Paul declareth here nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and living faith, which, nevertheless is the gift of God, and not man's only work without God. And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying." And when the Council of Trent declared against justification by faith only, it had respect to Luther's doctrine of a "*fides informis*," which S. James, whose Epistle Luther called an Epistle of straw, pronounced to be a dead faith, and therefore incapable of justifying. We hold the "*fides formata*," the faith which worketh by love, which, if we allow for differences of expression, is not so entirely irreconcilable with the Tridentine Doctrine, as at first sight we may be apt to imagine.

We have, however, travelled far away from Mr. Aitken and his argument. If he had seen the connection between justification and sanctification, we think he would have found a safer bond of union between Churchmen and Dissenters. He still would have shown to the latter, that it is something more than justification in its limited sense that they require, and that what they need the Church supplies, whilst at the same time he would have hesitated to call his brethren, who regard justification as a continual act of God's favour, accompanying sanctification, by the somewhat opprobrious epithet of "*unconverted Churchmen*." Let him observe the order in which S. Paul places them, "*But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God*." If justification precedes sanctification, why should S. Paul invert their order? but if they accompany each other, the order in which they are mentioned is immaterial.

It is true that children do not manifest the signs of justification, but if we must distinguish between them, may not the signs of justification rather be attributed to sanctification? and if sanctification is a gradual process, and the HOLY SPIRIT is given in proportion to the age and requirements of the baptized, might we not expect that such would be the case? but has Mr. Aitken never known holy children, the fervour of whose love, and the simplicity of whose faith might put to shame the graces of mature Christians? Even if he has not, he might have distinguished between the holiness of innocence, and the holiness of perfection. The SAVIOUR was holy and without stain of sin, whilst yet in His Mother's arms; no sign of holiness had ever yet been shown in act, and yet He was sinless; but the holiness which He had acquired at the end of His

life, was something in advance of that of His Infancy. "The Captain of our salvation was made perfect through the things that He suffered." The first was the holiness of innocence, which baptized infants receive from Him, but something more than this is the grace of the mature Christian, who has fought and conquered through CHRIST, Who dwelleth in him. The first innocence of childhood may have been lost, but the victor's crown is his; he may mourn the loss of the first, but he has obtained the second, and he gives thanks to God for this unspeakable gift. Each is a saint after his own order. The little one taken to his rest before actual sin had been committed, was the most innocently pure, but the aged warrior in CHRIST's army, was yet more noble, since he had wrought valiant deeds through and for his Master. He had received grace for grace; he had gone from strength to strength; he had traded with the talent committed to his keeping, and his shall be a glorious reward.

As the organ of a party in the Church which Mr. Aitken has specially attacked—would indeed that there were no parties—we feel bound to say something in our own defence.

"I have always regarded," says Mr. Aitken, "the Tractarian movement, which has as yet advanced no further than externalism, as a preparation for the revival of true Christianity. I may never see it, it may never be; but if spiritual life can be infused into Tractarianism, to a certainty the regenerate life will be developed and manifested along with it. The Tractarian mind cannot rest where it is. There will either be a relapse into former worldliness, which has been the case in too many instances already, or it will expend itself in abortive efforts to popularise a modified Romanism; and not a few of its adherents will probably become the victims of the delusion, that there is no reality in religion as they have not found any in Tractarianism; while a goodly remnant, it may be hoped, will accept the doctrine of grace in living fulness, and become the living witnesses of God for Christianity, and the reality of the regenerate life. It is impossible for an honest class of mind to be long captivated by the delusion that our baptized children are little saints, or to persist in denying that there must be somewhere a strait gate and narrow way which leadeth to the regenerate life. Their very honesty forces a certain kind of acknowledgment of truth, although they neither see it clearly, nor realise its power, because they are conscious that something more is to be had than what they possess."—P. 208.

We will not boast, but we think that tidings of what, under God's blessing, the Tractarian party has effected, may not yet have reached the distant parish of Pendeen, in Cornwall. Some may have rested in externals, and others may not have lived up to the life which they professed; but to the faithful Churchman, sacraments and services of devotion are not external signs. They may be so to the Evangelical, who regards the sacraments merely as re-

membrances to kindle faith, rather than as "effectual signs of grace, by which God doth work invisibly in us." The Tractarian movement has called the attention of large numbers of our men and women to the real responsibilities of the regenerate life. Its results are seen in the improved religious tone of our young men, and in the formation of schemes of self-denying charity too numerous to name. To distinguish parishes, as specially inviting observation, would be an invidious task, and therefore we forbear; but many such are in our mind, which if Mr. Aitken were to visit, he might find some reason to modify his opinion of the inefficiency of the Church movement. If he has failed at Pendeen, it may be his own inconsistency which has caused the failure. For ourselves we are satisfied with our position. To return to former worldliness would be an act of treason to our own souls, after we have tasted the richness of God's grace. To expend our energies "in abortive efforts to popularise a modified Romanism," we have no desire: for the rule of the Prayer Book and the customs of the ancient Church must be the models by which the beauty of holiness is restored in the Service of our Church, and the lives of the regenerate formed. This is not an empty sham, but if God be with us, as He has been during the last thirty years, a real, vital, spiritual work. Whatever our individual shortcomings may be—and they must not be charged upon the movement—we think we yield to none in the honesty of our purpose, and the sincerity of our aim. It is to our own Church Formularies, to Holy Scripture, and to the writings of our own Divines that we have appealed, and we are content to leave the decision to all candid men, whether we have not dealt with them more candidly and honestly than Mr. Aitken.

We are sorry in self-defence to be compelled to cast back the charge of dishonesty. It is a word which we feel should never be used in controversies between Christian men. Each should attribute to the other a conscientious conviction of the truth of the principles which he promulgates, and endeavour to find out articles of agreement rather than points of difference. There is so much that is excellent and true in Mr. Aitken's letters, that we regret that in his attempt to conciliate Dissenters, he has been betrayed into a want of charity towards Churchmen. Whether Dissenters or Evangelicals will be conciliated by the charge that they do not teach Christianity, we doubt, but we must leave them to answer for themselves, and take our leave of Mr. Aitken, trusting that he will reconsider his doctrinal idiosyncrasies before he again proposes them as a sure ground of reconciliation.

LONGFELLOW'S NEW VOLUME.

Tales of a Wayside Inn. By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW.
London : Routledge, Warne and Routledge. 1864.

WHEN we say that "*Tales of a Wayside Inn*" will fully sustain the high reputation of the author of "*The Golden Legend*," we feel we have said much. It was in that latter work that Longfellow put forth to view that great power as a poet, which many of his lesser poems had led us to look for ; it was that which revealed him to us in his full strength and genius. But if it fulfilled our highest expectations, it had at the same time, kindled new ones, and the hopes begotten by its perusal were, we must say, ill-satisfied by either of his two following works. *Hiawatha* may be very interesting to the Indians themselves, or to those who are conversant with their habits and manners, but it can never, we apprehend, be a general favourite among Englishmen. "*Miles Standish*" was thoroughly unworthy of the man who could write "*The Golden Legend*," and we could not but be provoked to see so great talents producing such inadequate results.

No such disappointment awaits the reader of the present work, for which we venture to predict a higher degree of popularity, than any of his former poems have attained.

The announcement of this publication will have produced pleasurable anticipations throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain, for Longfellow is essentially the poet whom all classes read and all classes appreciate. Men who do not know the name of our own Laureate, may yet be seen conning cheap editions of this poet from end to end ; comforting, bracing, amusing themselves by turns. To such Tennyson would speak an unknown tongue : Alexander Smith (with the enervating, dreamy atmosphere of the East, of pearls and cashmeres and ottar of roses, which to our mind, seems to pervade his pages) would be a sealed book ; and yet a man of equal intellectual calibre from over the Atlantic, makes himself heard and felt in their inmost soul. He does this too without any sacrifice, so to speak, of the full exercise of his high intellectual powers. Not the most fastidious critic ; not the most highly cultivated mind can fail to find full enjoyment in his pages. It is not by coming down to the masses that he finds his contact with them, rather from his own height he sends out silken clues by which they ascend to him, and are able to interpenetrate his mind and meaning. He appeals to those things which are common to all, the affections of man and his spiritual being, and in this way brings together his mind and that of his readers. The habitual turning to Catholic ritual for his similes and illustrations cannot

fail to strike every one who studies Longfellow's writings. Perhaps this characteristic is less marked in the present work than in others, but the following may serve to show that it is not altogether absent :—

“ Then over the waste of snows
The noon-day sun uprose
Through the dim mists revealed ;
Like the lifting of the Host
By incense clouds almost concealed.”—P. 135.

And this is but one phase of that constant appeal to the inner spiritual part of man, by which he lays hold upon us. Poetry is not a whit less true poetry because it is “ understood of the people :” obscurity is no element of its being, simplicity diminishes nothing from its majesty and beauty. Longfellow is not afraid to make himself understood lest he should be thought to be wanting in depth, for well does he know that oft-times shallow streams are least clear, while the eye can pierce the blue depths of ocean. He never indulges in fantastic compound words to express plain English ; nor does he study how great a distance he can make to intervene between a nominative and its verb, accomplishments in which some young poets glory. He does not disguise his thoughts, but rather clothes them so that all may recognise and make them their own. Whatever he writes then must be true poetry. Nevertheless we were gladdened by the idea that the title of this his latest production seemed to promise an exemption from the polysyllabic names which had been as sharp stones to our feet in the pilgrimage we had notwithstanding conscientiously accomplished from the very beginning to the very end of the Indian story. And when, fairly in possession of the volume, we looked in vain though still with some little trepidation, for any tracks of our Indian friends, we rejoiced again. Perhaps we cannot better justify the high praise we are able to give the “ Wayside Inn,” than by making our readers acquainted in some degree with the poems composing it, which are seven.

The construction of the book, which reminds the reader of course of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, is well chosen to give full play to that wonderful versatility which is one of the poet's great charms. The title will suggest to all that a party collected round the fireside at their ease, tells each his tale, and it would be difficult to spend an evening more delightfully than in joining this pleasant group, which is sketched in such a manner, as to make us see them and be among them as we read. First the Landlord,—

“ Grave in his aspect and attire
A man of ancient pedigree,
A Justice of the Peace was he
Known in all Sudbury as the ‘ Squire.’ ”

(A race of landlords such as he must, we think, be confined to America,—)

“ A youth was there of quiet ways,
A Student of old books and days,
To whom all tongues and lands were known,
And yet a lover of his own ;
With many a social virtue graced
And yet a friend of solitude ;
A man of such a genial mood
The heart of all things he embraced,
And yet of such fastidious taste
He never found the best too good.”

And we have a young Sicilian

“ In sight of Etna born and bred,”

who having joined one of the Italian rebellions, fled “in good king Bomba’s happy reign” across the Western seas, and so came to be this “Autumn night” among the group at the Inn in Sudbury Town.

Next a Spanish Jew, the description of whom we cannot spoil by curtailment, and have not space to quote entire.

“ It was rumoured he could say
The Parables of Sandabar,
And all the fables of Pilpay,
Or if not all the greater part—
Well versed was he in Hebrew books
Talmud and Targum and the lore
Of Kabala.”

Then a theologian whose amiable readiness to sacrifice dogma, and inculcate only the “Golden Rule” we might be better able to appreciate, if we did not remember that another theologian, who was at the same time the “Apostle of Love,” acted rather differently, and when he once found himself under the same roof with a noted heretic, did *not* say, “My dear Cerinthus, I am very glad we have met, that I who knew the LORD and had intimate revelations of His Divine Will, may assure you that a day is coming when not by our creeds, but by our deeds we shall be judged, and that the different views you and I take on certain doctrinal points, need not hinder our joining in love and good works.” We all know how the Apostle did act.

A Poet and a Musician complete the party. The musician is a Northman whose story is both from its length and beauty *the* poem of the collection, in which Longfellow gets on to his beloved Scandinavian ground, a region which seems to possess for him the enchantment which Tennyson finds in the deeds of Arthur and his knights, and the fame of the Round Table. But we are anticipating. Gladly would we give at length the picture of the musician,

but if we quoted as we wish, we should far exceed our limits. Nevertheless we cannot refrain from transferring the following to our pages.

“ Before the blazing fire of wood
 Erect the rapt musician stood ;
 And ever and anon he bent
 His head upon his instrument,
 And seemed to listen till he caught
 Confessions of its secret thought—
 The joy, the triumph, the lament,
 The exultation, and the pain ;
 Then by the magic of his art,
 He soothed the throbbings of its heart,
 And lulled it into peace again.”

Having brought together such a picked troop of story-tellers, a less perfect general than Longfellow might succeed in doing good service, and in his hands the work is complete. We are carried from land to land, from age to age. Each legend or story is a gem brought from the mine of history or fable, and cut and polished by his master-hand, and then strung into one by the pleasant interludes which connect the narratives, and—if we have forgotten it—remind us how it is we come to be hearing them at all, that we are sitting with this motley group of men of different lands and tongues around “the Squire’s” fireside in Sudbury Town.

“The Squire’s” story, which stands first, is of the American War of Independence, and he selects a circumstance connected with the first action at Lexington, and reading it as we do by our English fireside, we yet cannot help entering heart and soul into the “midnight ride of Paul Revere,” giving notice for miles and miles of the British movements, and preventing the surprise we had planned from being a surprise.

Next, the Student carries us to Florence, and a very pretty, gracefully told story follows. At the end of which, as the party discuss it with mingled praise and censure—the Jew volunteers

“ A story in the Talmud told,
 That book of gems, that book of gold.”

His *dramatis personæ* are Rabbi Ben Levi and the Angel of Death ; and he relates, in a poem of no small power and beauty, how it came to pass that this angel is now never seen by men, but walks the earth invisibly. Apropos of Angels, the Sicilian gives what is to our mind one of the most beautiful things in the collection, and of which we must give a brief outline.

King Robert of Sicily,

“ Brother of Pope Urbane,
 And Valmond, Emperor of Allemaine,”

one evening has his attention arrested by the words of the Magnificat,

"Deposuit potentes
De sede, et exaltavit humiles,"

and demanding their meaning from a clerk, his anger is greatly kindled, and he utters the evil boast,

"'Tis well that such seditious words are sung
Only by priests, and in the Latin tongue—
For unto priests and people be it known,
There is no power can push me from my throne!"

He falls asleep, and wakes only to find himself alone in the church. In the dim light he makes his way to the door—

"He cried aloud, and listened, and then knocked,
And uttered awful threatenings and complaints,
And imprecations upon men and saints.
The sounds re-echoed from the roof and walls,
As if dead priests were laughing in their stalls."

Finally the frightened sexton releases him, and in a frenzy of passion, he makes his way to his royal palace. But on reaching the banquet-room

"Blazing with light, and breathing with perfume,
There on the dais sat another king,
Wearing his robes, his crown, his signet-ring,
King Robert's self, in features, form, and height,
But all transfigured with angelic light.
It was an Angel, and his presence there
With a divine effulgence filled the air,
An exaltation piercing the disguise,
Though none the hidden Angel recognise."

King Robert's claims to be indeed himself, are met by scorn and anger on the part of the nobles—while by the Angel to him is assigned the office of king's jester, and for his counsellor he is to lead an ape.

"Thou shalt obey my servants when they call,
And wait upon my henchmen in the hall."

Taunted and mocked by the servants, at length he is allowed to welcome night. He sleeps, and on waking, hopes the wretched past to be a dream. But no, the first sight that meets his inquiring eye is his cap and bells, and the wretched ape.

"It was no dream, the world he loved so much,
Had turned to dust and ashes at his touch."

Sicily prospers greatly under the Angel's rule. Days pass, and the haughty monarch is still "unsubdued."

"And when the Angel met him on his way,
 And half in earnest, half in jest, would say,
 Sternly, though tenderly, that he might feel
 The velvet scabbard held a sword of steel—
 'Art thou the king?' the passion of his woe
 Burst from him in resistless overthrow,
 And lifting high his forehead, he would fling
 The haughty answer back, 'I am, I am the king!'"

Never does the proud man seem to trace his present degradation to that defiance of Divine Power which immediately preceded it. He hardens his heart, and so nearly three years pass, when messengers arrive at the court of Sicily from Pope Urbane, summoning King Robert to his city of Rome, on "Holy Thursday,"—by which is meant, we presume from the context, that day in Holy Week. The Angel receives his guests with great joy, and loads them with costly gifts.

"Then he departed with them o'er the sea
 Into the lovely land of Italy,
 Whose loveliness was more resplendent made
 By the mere passing of that cavalcade,
 With plumes, and cloaks, and housings, and the stir
 Of jewelled bridle, and of golden spur;
 And lo! among the menials, in mock state,
 Upon a piebald steed with shambling gait,
 His cloak of fox-tails flapping in the wind,
 The solemn ape demurely perched behind,
 King Robert rode—making huge merriment
 In all the country towns through which they went."—P. 70.

While the Pope

"With congratulations and with prayers,
 Entertained the Angel unawares,"

Robert made a last effort to identify himself as the king, and appeals passionately to his brothers,

"Do you not know me? does no voice within
 Answer my cry, and say we are akin?"

But again he is unsuccessful—

"And the poor baffled jester in disgrace,
 Was hustled back among the populace."

Easter rose upon Rome, and the presence of an Angel made the city bright, and filled men with fervour. And Robert

"felt within a power unfelt before,
 And kneeling humbly on his chamber floor,
 He heard the rushing garments of the LORD
 Sweep through the silent air, ascending heavenward."

From this time there is a change—his penance draws to a close,

and the Angel's work is well nigh done. The end must be given in the Poet's own words,—

“And when once more within Palermo's wall,
And seated on the throne in his great hall,
He heard the Angelus from convent towers,
As if the better world conversed with ours,
He beckoned to King Robert to draw nigher,
And with a gesture bade the rest retire;
And when they were alone, the Angel said,
'Art thou the king?' Then bowing down his head,
King Robert crossed both hands upon his breast,
And meekly answered him, 'Thou knowest best;
My sins as scarlet are; let me go hence,
And in some cloister's school of penitence,
Across those stones, that pave the way to heaven,
Walk barefoot, till my guilty soul is shriven.'
The Angel smiled, and from his radiant face
A holy light illumined all the place,
And through the open window loud and clear,
They heard the monks chant in the chapel near,
Above the stir and tumult of the street,
'He has put down the mighty from their seat,
And has exalted them of low degree!'
And through the chant a second melody
Rose, like the throbbing of a single string,
'I am an Angel, and thou art the king!'
King Robert, who was standing near the throne,
Lifted his eyes, and lo! he was alone,
But all apparelled, as in days of old,
With ermined mantle, and with cloth of gold;
And when his courtiers came, they found him there
Kneeling upon the floor, absorbed in silent prayer.”—

Pp. 72—74.

In reading this we were insensibly reminded of a graceful (though withal somewhat sentimental) poem of Miss Procter's, having much the same plot, though if we remember rightly, it is not an Angel, but the Blessed Virgin who personates her heroine. We think her poem must occur in the 2nd Series of her Lyrics. She would have acted more wisely if she had left hers, as Longfellow has his, without a moral.

It is not generous to come down too strongly on female powers of reasoning, but ladies might at least abstain from drawing inferences, which is a weak point of theirs; and perhaps Miss Procter would be shocked to find that she answers Cromwell's death-bed questions in a not very theological manner, when she says,—we quote from memory,

“No star is ever lost we once have seen—
We always may be what we might have been.”

And now, taking the poems in the order in which they stand, we come to the principal one of the collection, viz., "The Saga of King Olaf." This most carefully finished and artistic work, is composed of twenty-two short poems, which hang together like small miniatures, each perfect and complete in itself; and from which, taken altogether, we glean the grand life of this northern hero, as we read S. Stephen's history in Fra Angelico's paintings, on the walls of La Capella di Nicolo V.; or those of S. George and S. Barbara, on that armour of Henry VIII. in the Tower, which was, if we remember rightly, a present from the "last of the knights," the chivalrous Maximilian.

There is something very bracing in getting into the clear, frosty, crisp air of the north. *There is no "dolce far niente:"* all is *doing*; and all deeds are pregnant with vigour and life. Olaf, as Longfellow paints him, is a grand character, mingling the enthusiasm of the south, with the manliness of the north, and turning all his kingly power, and personal attractiveness, and youthful valour, and accomplishments, to the one object of establishing the kingdom of the "White CHRIST," and overthrowing the empire of Thor and Odin. To Englishmen he possesses a peculiar interest, since in our own London he is said to have been baptized, and from this land he took back with him, we believe, a staff of bishops and priests to evangelize his own dominions. We may remark in passing, how very early England seems to have been a centre whence missions proceeded; for we have the glory of S. Boniface, earlier even than Olaf's time. After so many centuries of experience, our work in that province should be well done. If, however, Olaf had his priest Thangbrand from us, we have little reason to boast of our son, whom, indeed, Olaf sent off to Iceland (when he could bear him no longer), "to convert the heathen there." But Thangbrand had no missionary spirit, and much preferred his life in Norway; so after making himself hated in Iceland,

"Much in fear of axe and rope,
Unto Norway sailed he then,
'O, King Olaf, little hope
Is there of these Iceland men,'
Meekly said,
With bending head,
Pious Thangbrand, Olaf's priest."—P. 120.

But to take things a little in their order. The poem opens with "The Challenge of Thor," of which we subjoin the closing stanzas:

"Force rules the world still,
Has ruled it, shall rule it,
Meekness is weakness,
Strength is triumphant,
Over the whole earth,
Still is it Thor's Day.

Thou art a God too,
 O Galilean !
 And thus single-handed,
 Unto the combat,
 Gauntlet or gospel,
 Here I defy Thee."—Page 79.

Olaf is represented as taking up this challenge, and becoming thus in a peculiar manner the champion of CHRIST's religion. Henceforth CHRIST's cause is his own, and his life is given to the planting of the Church in his wide dominions. We must give the description of the hero in the poet's own words ;

"Trained for either camp or court,
 Skilful in each manly sport,
 Young, and beautiful, and tall,
 Art of warfare, craft of chases,
 Swimming, skating, snow-shoe races,
 Excellent alike in all.

"When at sea with all his rowers,
 He along the bending oars,
 Outside of his ship could run.
 He the Smalsor Horn ascended,
 And his shining shield suspended,
 On its summit, like a sun.

* * *

"Norway never yet had seen,
 One so beautiful of mien,
 One so royal in attire,
 When in arms completely furnished,
 Harness gold-inlaid and burnished,
 Mantle like a flame of fire.

"Thus came Olaf to his own,
 When upon the night-wind blown,
 Passed that cry upon the shore.
 And he answered, while the rifted
 Streamers o'er him shook and shifted,
 'I accept thy challenge, Thor!'"

In these days, when we hear perpetual discussions as to the best mode of conducting our missions to the heathen, it is really refreshing to see the total freedom from perplexity on the subject which Olaf enjoyed. He goes about with his good Bishop Sigurd, and the utmost amount of persuasion he attempts, is to point to the ecclesiastic, and say,

"Here is my bishop, who the folk baptizes ;"

and "the folk" seem generally to have been quite convinced, though it is to be hoped—as was doubtless the case—that the holy bishop gave his catechumens a little more instruction, than their hasty

monarch was inclined to vouchsafe them. His "mission" to Drontheim is given rather fully. The people there make a demand on him, for sacrifices to Odin and Thor, which his predecessors, the Kings of Norway, had been in the habit of supplying. His answer is short, and to the purpose—

"I command
This land to be a Christian land,
Here is my bishop, who the folk baptizes."—P. 109.

And he goes on to say very significantly, that if they ask for sacrifices, those that he will offer shall be human. Next he strode to their temple, where,

"The image of great Odin stood,
And other gods, with Thor supreme among them."—P. 110.

These he speedily demolishes :

"King Olaf smote them with the blade
Of his huge war-axe, gold-inlaid,
And downward shattered to the pavement flung them."—P. 110.

This leads to a skirmish in which the leader of the people, he who had been foremost in demanding the tribute to the gods, is slain :

"King Olaf from the doorway spoke,
'Choose ye between two things, my folk,
To be baptized or given up to slaughter.'"

An *argumentum ad hominem* which was quite irresistible, and the entire conversion of the population follows.

"And seeing their leader stark and dead,
The people with a murmur said,
'O king, baptize us with thy holy water !'
"So all the Drontheim land became
A Christian land in name and fame,
In the old gods no more believing and trusting."

In the course of his crusade his zeal sometimes gets the better of him, and we see little, (so far as his character is drawn here,) of the *softening* influence of Christianity, unless by comparison with his contemporaries. In these days, however, a picture of thorough, uncompromising zeal is very pleasant. We must say we always most fully endorse that saying of (we think) Dr. Donne, "People talk very much of zeal without discretion, but I like it infinitely better than discretion without zeal." Therefore we can look leniently even on those actions which seem not quite becoming a Christian saint, when they were prompted by, what was the moving spirit of his whole life, zeal for his Master's glory.

We must remember, too, the spirit of the age in which he lived,

when, though the forms of chivalry were as yet confined to the centre of Europe (nor were even there fully developed;) yet the temper of mind which was embodying itself in them was working everywhere in some shape or another. So while other men in other lands were fighting for the honour of their country or of their "ladye love," and were expending themselves in jousts and tournaments, Olaf was using the same means to another end. An insult to Him, Whose battles he thought to fight by fire and sword, was an insult to himself; the worship of Thor and Odin was a personal affront to him, and he resented it as keenly and in much the same manner as a knight the slight to his lady. And it is, there is no doubt, one great evil of this day, that we do not sufficiently evince this spirit among ourselves. It is part, perhaps, of the general want of definiteness which characterised the theology of the last generation, by which we are apt to fail in realising the Personality of CHRIST and at the same time to let fall most essential doctrines. And this general haziness and indistinctness in matters of doctrine, influences not a little the practice of men, and leads to a general want of point and aim in their lives. The subject is too wide to enter on here, we only speak of it as illustrating the great difference between ourselves and men like Olaf,—who, whatever were their faults in the carrying out of their conceptions, yet did grasp clearly their own relation to CHRIST and His Church, and identified their honour with His Honour, and their interests with those of the Church.

Among ourselves an insult to a man's family, a slur cast on his honour, an outrage to his friend; these are among the unpardonable sins of this world. But let religion, let our LORD be dishonoured, then we begin to quote the 13th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, and to declare the blessedness of the meek, we are content to

"Conceal our creed, and live in closest tie
Of fellowship with those who count it blasphemy."

Olaf did his work according to the spirit of the times, and it succeeded; for, so far as we know, the Church planted by him in Scandinavia prospered after his death, and we read of no general apostasy.

With two more extracts we must close our notice of this poem which we have already extended beyond the limits we had set ourselves.

Bishop Sigurd has reminded Olaf, in answer to his assertion,

"All the old gods are dead,
All the wild warlocks fled,
But the White CHRIST lives and reigns,"—P. 121.

that the Viking Raud, a warlock and wizard, still lives and exercises his evil arts. Upon which Olaf declared his intention of

"talking with this mighty Raud,"—(Olaf's "talking" was not always a pleasant process to the person talked with.)

"So northward from Drontheim
Sailed King Olaf."—P. 124.

The Bishop accompanies him, and as they come near Raud's dwelling,—

" 'Tis the warlock ! 'tis the demon
Raud !' cried Sigurd to the seamen ;
' But the LORD is not affrighted
By the witchcraft of His foes.' "

The passage which follows is one of singular beauty.

"To the ship's bow he ascended,
By his choristers attended,
Round him were the tapers lighted,
And the sacred incense rose.

"On the bow stood Bishop Sigurd,
In his robes, as one transfigured,
And the crucifix he planted,
High amid the rain and mist.

"Then with holy water sprinkled
All the ship ; the mass-bells tinkled,
Loud the monks around him chanted,
Loud he read the Evangelist.

"As into the fiord they darted,
On each side the water parted,
Down a path like silver molten,
Steadily rode King Olaf's ships.

"Steadily burned all night the tapers,
And the White CHRIST through the vapours
Gleamed across the fiord of Salten
As through John's Apocalypse."—P. 127.

In the few extracts we have given, we have not aimed either at a sketch of the history in any order, nor at the selection of the passages of highest poetical beauty, (among the latter we may instance the last scenes of Olaf's life,) for these we must refer the reader to the book itself ; contenting ourselves with giving the final poem of the series, which sums up very beautifully the purpose and moral of the whole.

"In the convent of Drontheim
Alone in her chamber
Knelt Astrid the Abbess,
At midnight adoring,
Beseeching, entreating
The Virgin and Mother.

" She heard in the silence
 The voice of one speaking
 Without in the darkness,
 In gusts of the night wind,
 Now louder, now nearer,
 Now lost in the distance.

* * * * *

" The voice of S. John,
 The beloved disciple,
 Who wandered and waited
 The Master's appearance
 Alone in the darkness,
 Unsheltered and friendless.

" It is accepted,
 The angry defiance,
 The challenge of battle!
 It is accepted,
 But not with the weapons
 Of war that thou wieldest.

" Cross against Corslet,
 Love against hatred,
 Peace-cry for war-cry.
 Patience is powerful
 He that o'ercometh
 Hath power o'er the nations.

" As torrents in summer
 Half dried in their channels,
 Suddenly rise, though the
 Sky is still cloudless,
 For rain has been falling
 Far off at their fountains ;

" So hearts that are fainting
 Grow full to o'erflowing,
 And they that behold it
 Marvel, and know not
 That God at their fountains
 Far off has been raining.

" Stronger than steel
 Is the sword of the Spirit ;
 Swifter than arrows
 The light of the truth is :
 Greater than anger
 Is love that subdueth.

* * * * *

" The dawn is not distant,
 Nor is the night starless ;
 Love is eternal !
 God is still God, and
 His faith shall not fail us.
 CHRIST is eternal."—P. 180—184.

We must pass over the two remaining poems of the collection, of which the last is very far inferior to the others, and one wonders how it found its way among them. In "Torquemada" there are one or two flashes of poetry, but on the whole it is not striking.

Thus then we take our leave of this pleasant volume in which we are glad to welcome a book of high religious aim. If we do not find passages of such exquisite beauty as those which charmed us in the "Golden Legend," this is we conceive quite made up to us by the utter absence of the irreverence which in several instances marred our enjoyment of that work. The whole tone of the present book is reverent and devotional in an eminent degree, and looking along the line of the poets of the present day, it is cheering to see how many of their works partake of this character, how many on whom this high gift has been conferred, are to use the eloquent words of Alexander Smith in his "Edmund of Deira," "Strings to the world-harp added, praising CHRIST."

Of Owen Meredith's we recal only at this moment his "Ten Virgins," a short poem which is a powerful piece of word-painting, imaginative and beautiful in the extreme. A. Smith in his poem above referred to, has laid aside all that was even offensive in his former writings, and produced a work abounding in passages of wonderful delicacy and beauty, and breathing throughout a spirit of pure and earnest religion. Miss Procter's Lyrics are always smooth and graceful, sometimes rising to power, and are uniformly distinguished by a devotional spirit. We have seen some sacred verses of hers, which from their familiar tone were, to say the least, in bad taste, but in her two volumes there is nothing of the kind; it is a fault, we conceive, against which her own refinement of mind is her surest defence. And we must not forget to instance also some poems of singular beauty in Christina Rossetti's "Goblin Market and other poems."

To find this spirit pervading our poets is, we say, a most hopeful sign. Imagination is very near akin to Faith; they are twin sisters, and while the gaze of one is bent on low and earthly things alone, the other can hardly fix her sight on the objects which should engage her. He whose wont it was to speak in parables unto the people has hallowed thus the imagination of man and has at the same time pointed to its legitimate province, and most heartily do we accord our meed of welcome to those who make their high gift of song subservient to His Honour.

KINGSLEY'S GOSPEL OF THE PENTATEUCH.

The Gospel of the Pentateuch : a Set of Parish Sermons. By the Rev. C. KINGSLEY, F.L.S., F.G.S. Parker, Son, and Bourn.

Few things are, perhaps, more difficult than to be faithful to the Truth, and charitable towards those who in any degree differ from it. But in the natural body it is needful often to oppose the actions of some ailing member for its own good, and for that of the body ; and we know it is also needful to do it in kindness, and with care, lest we injure the body through the member.

Thus it is in the mystical Body of CHRIST at the present momentous time, when the reviewer is assailed with so many shades of opinion and doctrine from energizing members on all sides, each honestly offering his aid against the vital disease of infidelity which threatens the safety of a part of the body,—each coming forward with his specific as if it were infallible, though oftentimes, while it proves a remedy for one disease, it sets up another equally serious, but perhaps less apparent.

In a spirit of charity, therefore, we proceed to examine these Sermons, which were written, we are convinced, with the earnest desire of opposing the open infidelity of Colenso and others. To a certain extent Mr. Kingsley's intentions have been successful. But while offering his remedy against the errors of Colenso, he has proved his own lack of strength, and shown his religious tone to be inadequate to the emergency of the case.

The Sermons are a modest and unpretending production, intended conscientiously as a protest against the errors and scepticism of the age in matters affecting the Christian Faith, which must stand upon the genuineness of the Pentateuch and of the Old Testament generally. In the author's own words, "the value of the Bible teaching depends on the truth of the Bible story."

Thus far Mr. Kingsley fulfils his intentions : beyond this point we must, in justice to Catholic Truth, state his views to be unsatisfactory and dangerous. In order to prove this statement, we shall enter somewhat into detail.

The book is dedicated to Canon Stanley ; and the preface states that to him, and to his book on the Jewish Church, the author owes renewed confidence and energy in preaching to his people the Gospel of the Old Testament. Mr. Kingsley is not the only person who from this source has unconsciously imbibed the poison hidden beneath the eloquent and fascinating descriptions in Dr. Stanley's pages. Bishop Colenso's startling infidelity

rouses all earnest Christian minds, and they come forth with indignation to overthrow the undisguised enemy. Escaping eagerly from the yawning pitfall of scepticism prepared by the Bishop, what wonder that thousands rush into that of Dr. Stanley, allured by the rich beauty of the flowers strewn so lavishly by the way. Mr. Kingsley is evidently dazzled, and proves an apt pupil; for he states in his preface that the sermons before us were written with Dr. Stanley's book "in his hand!"

The first sermon, headed "GOD in CHRIST," is on Gen. i. 1, striking at once at the root of the disease for which the author really wishes to offer a remedy. It commences with a plain address on the Creation, as it is recorded in its simple grandeur, "In the beginning GOD created the heaven and the earth." In answer to the first inquiry man makes concerning himself and this world, "Where am I? How did I get here? and how did the world get here?" the Bible unfolds the great fundamental truth that GOD is the Maker of all. How and by what means, GOD does not permit us to know. He unveils Himself in His Creation as the High and Mighty: His method of creating He does not tell us, for the Bible is not a book of natural science, from which the finite intellect of the creature was ever intended to speculate on facts not revealed. It is a book of "the Revelation of GOD, of JESUS CHRIST; what He was, what He is, and what He will be." Thus far is Mr. Kingsley's language consistent; but, drawn aside by the allurements of the "book in his hand," he becomes bewildered, and starts off into a fruitless speculation on the words "Elohim" and "Jehovah," and from thence he begins, as does Bishop Colenso, to speculate on the probability of Moses not being the author of many parts of the Book of Genesis. The first chapter and the three first verses of the second chapter, he says, may owe their origin to some older prophet than Moses; though he does not offer any suggestion as to who the probable author could be. We would suggest that possibly it was written by Noah, while in the ark, thinking that a suitable occasion for giving an account of the Creation! Thus, being handed down to Moses, it was taken by him, and worked up into his own narrative. We give the author's own words:—

"Therefore all I shall say about the matter is, that the first chapter of Genesis and the three first verses of the second, may be the writing of a prophet older than Moses, because they call GOD 'Elohim,' which was His Name before Moses' time; and that Moses may have used them, and worked them into the Book of Genesis, while he, in the part which he wrote himself, called GOD at first by the name of 'JEHOVAH ELOHIM,' the LORD GOD, in order to show that 'JEHOVAH' and 'EL' were the same GOD, and not two different ones (!) As

for the first five books of the Bible, the Pentateuch, having been written by Moses, or at least by far the greater part of them, (!) I cannot see the least reason to doubt it. The Bible itself does not say so, and therefore it is not a matter of faith, and men may have their own opinions on the matter without sin or false doctrine. But that Moses wrote part at least of them our LORD and His Apostles say expressly. The tradition of the Jews (who really ought to know best) has always been that Moses wrote either the whole or the greater part. Moses is by far the most likely man to have written them, of all of whom we read in Scripture. We have not the least proof, and what is more, never shall or can have, that he did not write them. And therefore, I advise you to believe, as I do, that the universal tradition of both Jews and Christians, is right, when it calls these books, the Books of Moses." Pp. 6, 7.

This is a strange mixture of doubt and faith—of Stanley and Kingsley!

In the page before the above Mr. Kingsley tells his hearers that he is not going to trouble himself or them about the doubts and criticisms of the age which belong to scholarship; but glancing, we suppose, at the "book in his hand," he just throws in sufficient insinuations to set his hearers at work to speculate, if Moses did not write the first chapter of Genesis, and other passages through the Pentateuch, who did? And which were the parts really written by Moses? And so soon as these kinds of inquiries begin, even among scholars, where do they end? Bishop Colenso answers our question.

To go on with the second sermon, on "the likeness of God." Here we have a medley of truth and error, out of which it is impossible to gather anything like a consistent idea of man's actual condition after his fall. That God made man originally as He said, in His own image and likeness, and that man corrupted his ways, and became the victim of lust, cruelty, and pride,—that evil is now man's natural delight,—Mr. Kingsley admits; while he denies entirely that we lost the likeness of God by Adam's fall. We are further told that the "likeness of God" consists in a sense of "right and wrong," because the Bible says, "Behold the man is become as one of Us, to know good and evil." According to this, the "likeness" was obtained by sin. The author thinks of this, and answers, "Of course not; but man became aware of his likeness by sinning against it." We should say, he became aware of his loss; for certainly if "becoming one of Us" means being in the likeness of God, then man became the image of God by sinning. But the great crowning proof of man's likeness to God, Mr. Kingsley tells us, is the Incarnation of CHRIST! We quote the passage in full:—

"But the great proof that man is made in the image and likeness of God, is the Incarnation of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; for if human

nature had been, as some think, something utterly brutish and devilish, and utterly unlike GOD, how could GOD have become Man without ceasing to be GOD? CHRIST was Man of the substance of His Mother. That substance had the same human nature as we have. Then if that human nature be evil, what follows? Something which I shall not utter, for it is blasphemy. CHRIST has taken the Manhood into GOD. Then if manhood be evil, what follows again? Something more which I shall not utter, for it is blasphemy.

"But man is made in the image of GOD; and therefore GOD, in Whose image he is made, could take on Himself His own image and likeness, and become perfect Man, without ceasing to be perfect GOD.

"Therefore, my friends, it is a comfortable and wholesome doctrine, that man is made in the image of GOD, and one for which we must thank the Bible. For it is the Bible which has revealed that truth to us, in its very beginning and outset, that we might have, from the first, clear and sound notions concerning man and GOD. The Bible, I say; for the sacred books of the heathen say most of them nothing thereof." Pp. 19, 20.

If CHRIST was simply taking on Himself "His own image and likeness" in becoming Incarnate, as the author says, what purpose did His Incarnation serve? If man had not lost the likeness of his Maker by his fall, why did CHRIST leave the bosom of His Eternal FATHER, and tabernacle in the flesh? It was because man's sins had closed the gates of heaven against him for ever; because his nature was evil, that the Word became flesh. It was in order that we, being created anew in Him by the washing of regeneration, might be accepted, by virtue of our union with the Beloved. The FATHER looks upon the Face of His Only-begotten, the Brightness of His Glory, and the express Image of His Person; and in Him regards with favour all His members.

We give another quotation from this sermon :

"To know good and evil, right and wrong—to have a conscience, a moral sense—that is the likeness of GOD of which I wish to preach to-day. Because it is through *that* knowledge of good and evil, and through it alone, that we can know GOD, and JESUS CHRIST Whom He has sent. It is through our moral sense that GOD speaks to us; through our sense of right and wrong; through that I say, GOD speaks to us, whether in reproof or encouragement, in wrath or in love; to teach us what He is like, and to teach us what He is not like.

"To know GOD.—That is the side on which we must look at this text on Trinity Sunday. If man be made in the image of GOD, then we may be able to know something at least of GOD, and of the character of GOD. If we have the copy, we can guess at least at what the original is like."—Pp. 22, 23.

We cannot conceive a system more lowering to all that is Divine, than this practice of reducing the attributes of GOD to the level of man's moral sense of right and wrong.

We find the same spirit of depreciation throughout the whole volume. The story of Jacob and Esau (Sermon VI.) is well told, if we take it simply as a history of two brothers of opposite dispositions. One, the more calculating and deep-thinking of the two, obtained the birthright, by outwitting the other. The characters of the two, and their natural qualifications for the positions ultimately allotted them, are well described. To give an example:—

“It is natural, I know, to pity poor Esau; but one has no right to do more. One has no right to fancy for a moment that God was arbitrary or hard upon him. Esau is not the sort of man to be the father of a great nation, or of anything else great. Greedy, passionate, reckless people like him, without due feeling of religion or of the unseen world, are not the men to govern the world, or help it forward, or be of use to mankind, or to train up their families in justice, and wisdom, and piety. If there had been no people in the world but people like Esau, we should be savages at this day, without religion or civilization of any kind. They are of the earth, earthy; dust they are, and unto dust they will return. It is men like Jacob whom God chooses,—men who have a feeling of religion and the unseen world; men who can look forward, and live by faith, and form plans for the future,—and carry them out too, against disappointment and difficulty, till they succeed.”—P. 76.

But not one word is said of the spiritual truths underlying the history, and to which the whole of the circumstances point.

The sermon on Joseph (seventh) is reduced to a story of domestic life, and the instincts of the various relations of parent and child, husband and wife, brother and sister, are set forth as a proof of man's spiritual likeness to God. Speaking of them, the author says, “They come not from the earth below, but from the heaven above; from the image of God, in which man alone of all living things was made.” We do not wish to depreciate the sacred ties of domestic life; but if they are a proof of man's spirituality, and of his likeness to God, we are baptized in vain. The deep spiritual under-current in the history of Joseph is scarcely alluded to; but Mr. Kingsley tells us that it was to show how sacred and God-like are family ties, that Joseph's story is written in Holy Scripture!

The personal history of Moses (Sermon IX.) is related with interest, but Mr. Kingsley has said nothing of the giving of the Law by God on Mount Sinai. His death too (Sermon XVIII.) is told with pathos. From the latter we give an extract:—

“So Moses must vanish out of their sight, sadly and mysteriously. All they know of him is, that he is punished for a sin which he committed long ago, as you and I may be. All they know of his death and burial is, that his body was not left foully to the birds of the air,

and the beasts of the field. For the LORD buried him. They know not how, and did not need to know. And we need not know. Enough for them and for us to know, that no dishonour was done to the grand old man; that as he died far away on the lonely mountain top, without a child to close his eyes, his last look fixed upon the good land and large which lay spread out below, of entering which he had been dreaming, for forty—it may be for more than forty years—enough for us to know that the kindly earth received his body again into her bosom, and that the true Moses, the immortal spirit of the man, returned to GOD who created him, and inspired him, and sustained him to be perhaps the greatest man, save One who was more than man, who ever trod this earth.”—Pp. 229, 230.

“The plagues of Egypt” (Sermon X.) are well explained and graphically depicted.

We will bring this notice to a close by a brief examination of the thirteenth sermon, on “Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.” And here we cannot express too strongly our disapproval of the way in which Mr. Kingsley treats this important subject. He begins by stating that he does not understand several things in the chapter, and yet he goes on to explain it to his hearers. The rebellion of Korah and his company is described by our author to be a revolt against the national¹ and political laws of the Israelites—a breach of the peace which was punished by God, as a commander would strike down a rebel without trial or argument. They rebelled against the constitution which God had given them, and which was “no doubt quite fitted for them” (!): they broke the laws of discipline and order that are absolutely necessary to the well-being of a nation, and they were punished.

The particular point which led the rebels to revolt against Moses, Mr. Kingsley tells us, is a question which really matters little to us; it was merely a question about the priesthood, affecting Moses’ law, which of course is now done away.” (P. 162.) Moses is a kind of captain of a ship of war, and “if he had executed the martial law with his own hand, he would have been quite justified.” Is Mr. Kingsley, then, we ask, so entirely deaf to the awful warning voice against schism, which echoes from these rebel graves? Does he recognize no Korah in the present day, who for that same “question about the priesthood,” rebels against the constitution of a greater kingdom than that of Moses? And is this question really one of such little importance to him, that he views it simply as he would

¹ The fact is, Mr. Kingsley has made a thorough mistake in reading this history, and has failed to see that there was a union here of two parties—one a political party under Dathan, the representative of Reuben Jacob’s first-born, who wished to recover the birthright for his tribe; the other a schismatical heretical body, who desired to advocate the extending the priesthood to the whole tribe of Levi.

the breach of a national law? S. Peter (2 S. Pet. ii. 1), and S. Jude, 11, evidently thought otherwise.

We cannot, we think, do better than conclude this with an extract from the Bishop of Oxford's Charge :

"What we want," the Bishop says, "is more distinctive Church teaching. . . . We should not be able to maintain the Divine authority of the Scriptures, if we gave up the Divine authority of the Church. The two are absolute correlatives. In the Church's sense of the words, we could have no Bible, if we had no Church ; for the Church is its witness and its keeper. The Church is and must be before the Bible ; it must propound the Bible to each separate soul as the Word of God. . . . And unless the Divine breath inspired her judgment, how could she discern the truth, or settle the canon of the inspired book ?"

If Mr. Kingsley had held the Bishop's Charge "in his hand," instead of Dr. Stanley's book, the result might have been different. He may think that in this volume he is defending the Pentateuch. In our judgment he is giving up its legitimate defences. He just says that there are many things in these books which he does not understand ; and that with regard to the rest, "men have thought differently." He individually happens to think that some are "righteous and noble stories," and implies that many think the reverse. Will this help faith? We think not.

THE DAILY SERVICE.

THE main and most palpable fallacy of the theory lately put forth by Mr. Stuart, on which we offered some strictures in our October number, is his gratuitous assumption that the Matins and Evensong Offices of the English Prayer Book were an intentional substitution for and have accordingly superseded the system of Low Masses, which prevailed at the time of the Reformation. The gist of his whole argument, summarily stated, amounts to this, 'Here for the last three hundred years, you have been putting to the test of actual experiment the practical efficiency of the stated Anglican form of public worship ; and what after all has been the measure of success in which this full proof of our ministry has resulted? Surely, the time is come when the logic of facts must compel us candidly to confess the utter failure of the present system ; when, if we are wise, we must endeavour to rectify the mistake that has been made, and revert to the old abandoned form, which is still so successful in Roman Catholic countries. Compare the crowds of worshippers of all ranks which every

day frequent the early *Masses* in continental churches, with the scanty attendance of the refined and highly educated at our Daily Service ; and let us strive by adoption of the same attractive system to recover our lost people, and refill our empty naves !' Such, we believe, is a full and fair statement of Mr. Stuart's reasoning on the question, and of those who think with him. Such at least was the course of argument to which we addressed a reply in our last October number.

In order truly to estimate the value of his reasons, it is necessary in the first place to clear the premises of a perplexing confusion of terms and propositions, under cover of which lurk a multitude of sophisms. This was the main purport of our former article. There is a manifest indistinctness in the statement of evidence afforded by the number of worshippers attracted under the two systems, between the LORD's Day and the week day Services. It is altogether false to say that, as regards the *Sunday Service*, the Anglican system has proved an utter failure. Our churches, which are far more numerous in proportion to the population, are, to say the least, as crowded as the foreign churches. That the worshippers in towns consist principally of the higher and middle classes, to the comparative exclusion of the poor, is in no degree a proof of the unpopularity of the services, but is sufficiently accounted for by other obvious causes, of which the "odious pew system" is the most manifest. The truth rather is, that the services themselves are so far popular and attractive that the number of the favoured classes attending them, has availed to shut out the poor. The sound inferential argument therefore would surely be not in favour of abolishing the present form of worship, but in multiplying the occasions of it, and increasing the facilities of attending it "without respect of persons." In this warfare Mr. Stuart may safely reckon on us as a most willing and faithful ally. And then as regards the scanty attendance on our week-day service, neither is this surely owing, as is alleged, to its unpopularity (unless what is sufficiently popular to attract large congregations on the Sundays, ceases to be so during the remainder of the week) but again to a multitude of other very obvious causes, of which several were specified in our former article. Above all, it is a most flagrant mis-statement and perversion of the truth to say, that our present system has been undergoing the test of actual experiment during the last three hundred years. What with political convulsions, and puritanical excesses, and a reactionary infidelity and latitudinarianism, our popular religion has found its principal vent in mutual persecution, theological controversy, and study of the "evidences ;" and so far as regards the present race of Churchmen, it was not till the middle age of the adult living population, when early religious habits

and associations had taken too firm a hold to be easily relinquished, that the duty and blessing of worshipping God in public on week-days as well as Sundays, was pressed upon the conscience of the nation.

And then in the face of no little inveterate prejudice, invincible ignorance, and active party opposition. In Mr. Stuart's own nursery and school days, the Anglican system of Daily Service was purely theoretic and exceptional; the exceptions being limited to our few dreary cathedrals and the college chapels of Universities. To many of us it seems but the other day that earnest Churchmen would steal in the grey mornings to chant the rough Gregorians of the *Laudes Diurnæ* in Margaret Street, with something of the same guilty sense of belonging to a hated sect as the early Christians skulking to their Offices in the catacombs. The flame of devotion once rekindled, spread "like sparks among the stubble," wherever prepared minds were ready to catch fire. The result was soon made manifest in the publication of Mr. Masters' "Guide to Divine Service," which set forth a list of churches throughout London and the country, where Daily Service and Weekly Celebrations were in practice. The Guide (now published in the Calendar of the English Church Union) records at the beginning of the present year 870 churches in all where the Daily Service is "said or sung;" of which number eighty are in London and the neighbourhood. With this result, however, which considering all adverse circumstances appears to us quite marvellous, Mr. Stuart is not satisfied; partly because the recitation of the Offices, as he affirms, is an irksome task, distasteful to the clergy; and chiefly because they have failed to attract as many worshippers, especially of the lower classes, as he supposes they ought to do, and as he imagines would be done by substituting a series of "Low Masses."

We have already sufficiently stated our reasons for coming to a contrary conclusion, and some serious positive objections to the adoption of his plan. We desire further, in the present article, to expose the fallacy above referred to, which appears to underlie the whole theory he advocates with regard to the relation of our present Daily Service and that which prevailed before the Reformation. There is no difficulty in tracing clearly the origin and development of our present Prayer Book; and its history furnishes a complete refutation of any supposed antagonism between the Eucharistic and ordinary Daily Offices, as if the use of the one necessarily implied the disuse or disparagement of the other; on which purely imaginary hypothesis, we repeat, Mr. Stuart appears to have built his baseless fabric of a vision. The whole force of his argument depends on the assumed notion of a *substitution*. "This was substituted for *that* at the time

of the Reformation, and has proved in practice an utter failure ; therefore let *that* be now substituted for *this*, and the result will most probably be successful." The truth is that the change of system in public worship which took place at the Reformation was not in the nature of a substitution ; but in the way partly of an expansion, partly of a consolidation, of existing forms. The improvement aimed at was rather an increase than a diminution of services, and to infuse into them a new spirit of heartiness and reality, first by rendering them in the vernacular, and then by adapting the claustral and private offices to congregational and common use.

It is a vulgar error to suppose, as Mr. Stuart and some of his supporters¹ seem to suppose, that our Matins and Evensong were imported into parish churches directly from the cloister, and are not suitable, nor were ever intended for the use of lay persons. They are not *merely* expurgated translations of the Offices from the Sarum Breviary, tacked and tinkered together for the nonce by blundering workmen, to serve the pressing exigences of the Reformation. Not only had the Matins, Lauds, and Prime, the Vespers and Compline, been long condensed into two only separate forms, used daily at Morning and Evening Service ; but the united forms were simplified and familiarized to the laity, both in Latin and English, by their constant use of them in their books of private devotion. Many Primers were in circulation, certainly as far back as the fourteenth century,² long before that of 1545, "set forth by the King's Majesty and his Clergy, to be taught, learned, and read ; and none other to be used throughout all his dominions." Our Book of Common Prayer was a laudable attempt to compose prevailing differences by reducing the old familiar Offices to uniformity, and adapting them to public use. It is a mistake to imagine that the people in general were then called upon for the first time to use Offices which were intended for, and used only hitherto by, the Religious and the Clergy. The same may be said of the Litany : "This form of petition, used in solemn processions, had been in the hands of the people in their own tongue in the Primer, certainly for a hundred and fifty years."³ The great purpose in view was to allay religious discord, by getting people to meet together in common worship ; not in dribblets, as heretofore, coming and going as each listed, and each using his own favourite private Office, but with one heart and soul, walking by

¹ E.g., the writer of a "communicated" article in the current number of the *Union Review* ; couched, we must honestly add, in a very bad spirit of arrogance and rash assertion, and calculated, neither in matter nor manner, to conciliate opinions to the author's side of the question, or to the general principles of the review.

² Maskell gives the contents of one (circ. 1400) : "Matins and Hours of our Lady, Evensong and Compline," &c. See also Procter, and Freeman, *passim*.

³ Procter, p. 15.

the same rule and minding the same thing, as a united congregation. The same motive, no doubt, chiefly led to the discountenance of private masses in side chapels, and the injunction to attend all, as a crowd of worshippers, at the single high altar. Not that there appears to have been the smallest intention of superseding attendance at the daily celebration. On the contrary, the main object was to make the service congregational; and this led to the requirement of a certain number of attendants, in the case of early and repeated celebrations. Bonner, indeed, is expressly charged with having retained private masses in the side chapels at S. Paul's; and Hooper writes to Bullinger in December, 1549, "*Altaria hic in multis ecclesiis facta sunt aræ. Usus cœnæ Domini publicus procul abest a forma et institutione Domini: licet sub utrâque specie ministratur, tamen aliquibus in locis ter in die celebratur cœna. Ubi olim mane celebrabant missam Apostolorum, habent communionem Apostolorum; ubi missam D. Virginis, habent communionem quam vocant communionem Virginis; ubi altam vel summam missam, jam summam communionem, sic vocant. Vestes illas ac lumina ad altaria servant adhuc; cantant semper in templis horas et alios hymnos qui ad cœnam spectant, tamen nostrâ linguâ. Et ne pereat papatus, sacrificuli etsi Latinum idioma abrogare coguntur, tonum eundem ac musicam semper diligentissime observant, quem hactenus in papatu solebant.*" This complaint, most interesting and important on many accounts, was written six months after the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. had been brought into general use in the previous June by the Act of Uniformity, and most completely dispels the absurd notion of a substitution. There is, in the reason of the case, no more ground for supposing any antagonism, incongruity, or incompatibility between the Eucharistic and the Hour Offices, than between the Breviary and the Missal. The Order of Communion, still "commonly called the Mass," was indeed the first Office published separately in its authorized English form. And when the other Offices were subsequently ordered, the Prayer Book in its completeness was generally well received, even by Romanizers, who attended the ordinary Matins and Evensong, without an apparent idea of their interfering in any way with the celebration of the daily Sacrifice. *In multis ecclesiis*, as we have seen, even three daily celebrations continued, in spite of the additional offices, to be observed as heretofore. And so it *might* have continued to the present day, but for other untoward circumstances, easily ascertainable, to which we shall presently advert.

Let then these two historical points be duly borne in mind in all theories about the Daily Service. First, that the Offices of the Prayer Book were not forced, in the first instance, upon a reluctant people; but were readily accepted, and perhaps eagerly

demand, by those who were already familiar with the forms in private use. Besides which, it must not be forgotten that the laity at that time included in their ranks many thousands of Religious persons¹ of both sexes, who, by dissolution of their Houses and Orders, had been forced to retire into a virtual lay communion, and would accordingly appreciate the return to a congregational service. Secondly, that whatever causes operated to the subsequent failure of the Daily Service are applicable alike to the higher and the lower Offices. Both started together, so to say, fairly on their common course; both, theoretically, have been subjected to the same lengthened test of a three hundred years' experiment; both, in a certain sense, have alike broken down under the experiment,—the one on week-days, the other also on the Sundays: if the one proved on trial “unpopular,” and “distasteful” to the Clergy, so, judging by results, we must come to the same conclusion as regards the other. Unpopular, no doubt, irksome, and distasteful, devotions in any set form will always be to an ungodly, secularized, puritanized, distracted, disobedient, and gainsaying people; and one or other of the qualities expressed in these epithets has been the condition of the nation as a whole during almost all the period in question. If only we try to realise the troubles and internal ruptures produced by the succession and reign of Mary; the total alienation of the Romanizers in Elizabeth's reign; the unceasing discord, strife, rebellion, and final triumph of Puritanism under the Stuarts; the dreary decade of the Commonwealth; the profligacy, compromise, latitudinarianism which followed the Restoration; the Protestant deadness, irreligion, Erastianism, and infidelity which came in with Dutch William, and prevailed through the Georgian era to our own very day; all wonder, we think, will soon cease at the general decay of the devotional life and practice among us, and the apparent “failure” of the forms in which it is embodied.

It is not, however, quite so easy to trace each distinct step in this decadence. No doubt the falling off of the Romanist party, and the gradual spread of ultra-Protestant principles, introduced by the foreign reformers, must soon have begun to tell unfavourably upon the working of the new system. The throng of worshippers, and especially the number of communicants, in most places probably very soon declined below the prescribed standard. The required minimum of actual communicants, must have been a chief practical difficulty from the beginning, as it is now, in the way of continual daily celebrations. The intention, no doubt, was the same as that aimed at by the Decree of Trent, (Sess. xxii. cap. vi.)² being directed

¹ Hollinshed says, that 10,000 monks were turned out by the dissolution of the lesser monasteries alone.

² Optaret quidem sacro-sancta Synodus, ut in singulis Missis fideles adstantes non

against the universally prevalent neglect of Communion, the obligation to and customary practice of which, seem to have reached the extreme limit of once a year.¹ It was hoped, probably, that at least three or four sufficiently earnest and prepared members of the congregation might be forthcoming on every occasion to ensure a celebration, and that so the bad custom might be gradually improved. The authorities, however, evidently anticipated the difficulty so occasioned; for, though the rubric providing for the use of the same Gospel, Epistle, and Collect, and the same Preface through the week, plainly contemplates the theory of a daily celebration, and that about "notices" supposes the presence of a congregation, the direction to use the ante-Communion (*missa sicca*) office in any case, as plainly provides for the not improbable contingency of an insufficient number of communicants. The rule unhappily, aided by the remissness of the people, and too easy acquiescence of the priests, was not many years in settling down into the permanent result of long intervals between actual celebrations; so that even in George Herbert's age, before the Rebellion, six times a year seems to have been the ordinary country modicum, and as his own life shows, Daily Service in any form had become exceptional. Matins, Litany, and Table Prayers, had also by this date, as appears from the "Country Parson," become the programme of the Sunday Service. The Litany and Communion Offices went together from the first, the former introductory and preparatory to the latter.² But the Matins originally, there can be no question, was an entirely distinct and independent Service, and the opening service of the day. In proof, there is the often quoted memorandum in Strype's Life of Grindal, "The new Morning Prayers began now first, (Sep. 1559), at S. Antholin's in Budgrow, ringing at *five* in the morning." How soon and why the Collect, "O God, Who hast safely brought us to the *beginning* of this day," got relegated to an hour approaching noon, it is not easy to determine,³ except on the same hypothesis of general care-

solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam Eucharistiæ perceptione communicarent, quo ad eos sanctissimi hujus sacrificii fructus uberior proveniret.

¹ Allowed by indulgence of Innocent III.

² "Immediately before *High Mass*, the priests, with other of the quire, shall kneel in the middle of the church, and sing or say plainly and distinctly the *Litany* which is set forth in English with the suffrages following." Injunction of Edward VI. in Bishop Sparrow's Collections. The same injunction was repeated by Elizabeth.

³ The difficulty is well discussed in Blunt's "Reformation in England," chap. x. As a parallel absurdity, it is no uncommon thing to hear, even now, Bishop Ken's hymn at the same hour—

"Awake, my soul, and with the sun
Thy daily stage of duty run;
Shake off *dull sloth*, and *early rise*,"

&c., (i. e., at *mid-day* /) Blunt supposes the change to have been caused by "the difficulty of gathering together a congregation at break of day, discipline being now relaxed." *Ibid.*

lessness and indevotion. "As with the people so with the priest." Nor did matters much mend after the Restoration. Such books indeed as Bishop Cosin's *Hour Devotions*, which "ran through ten editions, the last of which was published in 1719,"¹ and of which it was said, "Not one book was in more esteem with the Church of England, next to the Office of the Liturgy itself," seems to show a still latent appreciation of Catholic devotional forms. And the well-known "Table of Public Services in London, in the beginning of the eighteenth century," extracted from the "*Pietas Londinensis*,"² would seem to prove that the rule of daily matins and Sunday celebrations in parish churches, had far from dwindled down at that time to the almost universal abeyance prevailing in our own childhood. The same causes, however, whatever they were, which found their final issue in the race of fox-hunting, port-wine-drinking parsons, who ministered to our grandsires, operated no doubt with concomitant effect in the extinction of the Daily Service.

In this necessarily hasty and imperfect sketch, our intention has been merely suggestive of a large and very interesting question. Our readers can fill up the outline for themselves, according to their means at hand of reference on the subject. What has been said will suffice to indicate the general bearings of the inquiry, and furnish the best groundwork of theory, as to the most practicable mode of dealing with the state of things we find existing in the Church at present. Mr. Stuart and his followers are for going back to the system in operation before the Reformation. *We* rather are for taking the rule of the Prayer Book as it stands, and putting it into practice. This object, we consider, will be most satisfactorily effected, not by any sudden revolution or compulsory measure, but by gradually *converting* the people to the true ideal; and such conversion must necessarily be a work of time, pains, patience and perseverance. Thank God! the work is going on, if slowly, yet as we hope all the more surely on that account. The principle of Daily Matins and Evensong, weekly, (and where practicable, daily) celebrations, the assistance of non-communicants, music, ritual, free and open churches, is winning its way to general acceptance. There is no need to alter a letter of the Prayer Book in order to carry it out in fulness. We want no change of rubric, or of any law, civil or ecclesiastical, to enable the multiplication of "Low Masses," even to the extent of Mr. Stuart's standard, wherever the condition of the people would justify an increase. Beyond the injunction and letter to Bonner above referred to, which have no legal force, "I know of no re-

¹ Editor's Preface to Twelfth Edition, (Rivingtons, 1841.)

² Reprinted (from the *British Magazine* for March, 1838) in *Tracts for the Times*, No. 84; which last-named should be read, as containing a catena of Anglican authorities on the obligation of the Daily Service.

striction," says one of our best of modern ritualists, the late Dr. Wright, "having existed as to the number of Communions in the Reformed Church of England."¹ Where we do seem to differ from Mr. Stuart, and to agree with the Council of Trent, is as to the desirableness of a certain number of communicants *at every celebration*.² We should be very sorry to return to the state of things in this respect which prevailed before the Reformation; and we think the requirement of a minimum number no unwarrantable restriction.³ We do *not* think, as Mr. Stuart appears to do, that the edification of the people is the end of the Holy Eucharist. We think it is the glory of God: and that this end is not conduced to by the presence of an indiscriminate, unprepared, and indevout crowd. Neither do we take so much a subjective as an objective view of the ordinary service; nor measure its success or failure by degrees of attractiveness and popularity. Not of course but that the highest object is intensified in proportion to the number of earnest worshippers; and we quite think that the circumstantials of the Daily Service, as it is sometimes conducted, are not only not attractive, but positively repulsive.⁴ We believe that much more might be done than has commonly been done to increase the number of regular attendants; as by private influence, repeated instruction, the choice of convenient hours, the abolition of the pew system, attention to ritual, and music. Some clergy have trusted too simply to the intrinsic attractiveness of the Prayer Book Office; and having once started the Daily Service, have left it to the operation of its own *vis inertia*, with no further energetic endeavour to *keep it up*, or to improve it, and increase the number of attendants. No wonder they have felt disheartened at its apparent failure, and have acquiesced despondingly from a sense of

¹ Additional Notes in Appendix to his excellent Edition of "Wilson on the Lord's Supper," (Cleaver, 1851,) p. 249.

² *In singulis missis.*

³ We have met with a ridiculous objection on the ground of the impracticability of communicating large numbers, because of the impossible time it would take up; as if the difficulty, so far as it has any reality, would not be increased indefinitely by postponing the communicants to once or three times a year, at the great Feasts, when they might come all at once. The late Dr. Wright observes, "By a judicious arrangement in a church, where there are but three clergymen employed in the administration, and where the Rubrics are strictly attended to, the time taken in giving the Communion averages about twelve minutes to each hundred communicants. By employing additional hands, the time is proportionally shortened." He mentions also "a district church where there is a double Communion every Sunday, and the average number at the first celebration exceeds one hundred, at the second one hundred and sixty." (Appendix to "Wilson on the Lord's Supper," Cleaver, 1851, pp. 176, 229.)

⁴ The writer not long since attended week-day Matins at a London church, not a mile from S. Mary Magdalen's, of which the incumbent, on a late great occasion, read a paper on "the management of a large parish." Prayers were said in a low voice, at the end of the north aisle, near the vestry. The church is blocked with pews; and the writer tried in vain to get near enough to hear the Service properly, for the pew doors were locked. There was one old woman only present besides. Is this a model way of "managing a large parish?"

duty, in their perfunctory dead-alive performance of it. It is this sort of murmuring disparagement of it, which is perhaps most sharply to be condemned, as the worst and most suspicious feature of Mr. Stuart's theory.

For our own part, we consider that it would be an unspeakable misfortune to the English Church, that her "psalmody should cease," and so there should be taken out of her hands one of the chief weapons, at once the sword and the shield of the Spirit, provided against the coming of Antichrist, and the great struggle of the last days. The unceasing recitation of the Holy Psalter in the public service is a standing witness in an infidel age of the Church's faith in its Divine inspiration and Christian meaning. Then, again, amidst all our decay of discipline, there is an untold stay and comfort in the daily, morning and evening, opportunity afforded of priestly absolution, to consciences sufficiently tender and penitent to feel the weight of habitual weaknesses and short-comings, ignorances and surprises, not to mention wilful falls, and can make a clean breast of them in the General Confession. It is most surprising and distressing to hear the glib way in which some people talk, of throwing away whole offices, or portions of offices, which to others, who accept them as realities, bear an inestimable value. It is a shallow view, indeed, which overlooks the sacramental character of the ordinary office, and its instrumentality in leading on to a higher and more directly Eucharistic worship. We have seen it in our own day develope into weekly and daily celebrations. By it principally souls were trained and prepared for habitual contemplation of the greater mysteries, and in it afterwards, through its union with the same, have found a never-failing exercise of spiritual communion. It has been, and we trust it will continue to be, more and more effectively amongst us, a daily step to the Altar. To charge it would be as reasonable as to charge Christianity itself with *failure*, and to give it up for some other author's system, because of its apparent unattractiveness and unpopularity, its irksomeness and weariness, its slowness in converting souls, lost in worldliness and selfishness, according to our poor human notions of Divine methods and means of grace.

P.S. The greater part of the above Article was written before the author saw Mr. Stuart's "Second Letter to the Editor of the *Ecclesiastic*." He can now only express his disappointment, that one whom he has so respected for his ability and zeal in the service of the Church, should allow himself, in discussing so very grave a question, to divert attention from the merits of the case, to flippant personalities; and his regret that he has been the occasion of Mr. Stuart showing himself off to such disadvantage. He must decline any more contest in mere banter.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Some Analogies between the Human and the Mystical Body, applied to Difficulties and Duties in the Church. Part I.: Difficulties in the Church. By the Rev. THOMAS W. PERRY, Assistant Curate of S. Michael and All Angels, Brighton. Masters.

THIS publication, has, we think, admirably fulfilled its intention. In carrying out the analogy between the Human and Mystical Body, the author cannot fail in helping many of his readers to overcome difficulties, which more or less must have arisen in most Christian minds, in reference to the position occupied in the Body of CHRIST, by a large number of baptized persons among us, who yet do not conform to the discipline and practice of the Church.

The natural body, though composed of many members, yet is but one body still—the members being diverse, but uniform—the eye, the ear, the hand, the foot, each different, and by that difference helping to complete the symmetry of the body, and assisting to perform its one work, for “all members have not the same office.”

“Such,” says Mr. Perry, “is that corporation spiritual whose earthly members are joined to it by the invisible operation of the HOLY GHOST, Who unites to the Divine humanity of the SON of GOD every *validly* baptized person, *i.e.*, every one who has been touched with water ‘In the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST,’ however *irregularly* that act may have been performed.”

The Body of CHRIST, the Church, is the aggregation of a countless number of single parts, into a Divinely organized whole, knit to the SON of GOD, “Which is the Head,” and bound each to the other by the one Spirit who dwells in them, “for as we have many members in one body, . . . so we being many, are one body in CHRIST, and every one members one of another.”

Mr. Perry next proceeds to show, by carrying out the analogy, that if such wonderful results are found in the natural body, from the diversity of members, so it is GOD’s intention that the same should be produced in the Mystical Body, which is organic, and composed (similarly to the human body) of an ever-increasing, and ever-changing multitude of members, severally united to it by one Divine Spirit, Who dwells within it; ruled by one Divine Head, in Whom it lives, and moves, and has its being, and from Whom flows grace to every member.

The question naturally following, is the difficulty arising from the diversities of practice, doctrine and discipline, existing in the Body of CHRIST, by reason of which many doubt even its very existence. This difficulty the author very ably answers, by carrying out the analogy under three separate heads.

I. “Decisions and teachings adverse to the Faith: contradictory or diverse doctrine.” We will give his argument in as few words as possible. To the objection that the Spirit of CHRIST cannot thus contradict Himself, he says:—

"*The objection really contains its own answer.* For the very fact that this contrariety occurs, implies the *presence* of Divine Truth; and how, it may be asked, can such truth *exist*, much more *energize*, where the Spirit of Truth is Himself *wholly absent*? So that to contend—that the internal oppositions touching Faith and Doctrine which occur in any society of baptized men, are proofs that such a community is *cut off* from the Body of CHRIST, would be as inconsistent an argument as if, because contractions naturally occur, or can be produced by irritants in an amputated member, one were to assert that convulsive action in a limb, betokened that the surgeon's knife had divided the structures which joined it to the body."

The objection itself is thus proved to be groundless, the human type of the Church meets it by anticipation. Further, to affirm that any class of baptized men are severed from the Church by these differences, is to lose sight of the benefit of lawful excommunication, and to assume that diversity of opinion destroys the channel of grace, instead of suspending the flow of grace, as a ligature stops the current of blood. This, of course, could not be thought to encourage differences of opinion, any more than to advocate the suspension of the current of blood; but it simply proves the fact of membership in all the baptized, who profess to believe in, and to follow the Head.

II. "Variety of practice, and distinction in discipline." To give the author's own words:—

"Take then the objection in its very worst form; let it be granted that there are unions of baptized men in which no perceptible trace remains of any of those ancient and common *forms and observances* which from the first have everywhere marked the worship of the Catholic Church; would this absence any more authorize us in *denying* these men to be of the Church, than the appearance of some emaciated or swollen part of a human limb would warrant us to pronounce that it formed no portion of that limb? It might be that neglect, or accident, or evil design had so injured the part, both externally and internally, as to make its preservation, and much more its restoration, seemingly impossible; yet some of the nerves and minuter vessels might remain sufficiently sound that, with the aid of proper remedies, the injured member would be so far restored, as not to be wholly useless, nay, would even in time regain its former appearance, either with or without that loss which sloughing produces. Who then will be bold enough to affirm that in such congregations of Christians as these now referred to, there are *none* retaining sufficient of their first grace to maintain *some* vitality in the system which surrounds them,—enough it may be ultimately to revive and reform it, though, possibly, with the absolute loss of a clinging and corrupting mass which gradually disappears or falls away, by reason of its inherent unholiness, or disbelief, or perverseness?"

Thus, however much the several parts of the whole may appear to be, or are, unlike, or at variance, there is an insensible action, inseparable from the indestructible organization of the Body of CHRIST, so planned by its Divine Author, that there should be in reality, "no schism in the body." It is further objected,

III. "That as no actual communion subsists among all the congregations of Christians, which overspread the earth; but an absolute opposition is found between many of them, so it is impossible that they can form the visible portion of the one Mystical Body of CHRIST."

Here, again, the answer is explicit. By virtue of the almost indestructible power of the grace of the Sacrament of Regeneration in which

we are united to the Body, actual schism does not frequently exist, even in the midst of differences. S. Paul in writing to the Corinthians, a company of baptized men, of whom it could not be said that they all bore the fruits of the Spirit, because he charges them with being "carnal," with "strife," and with "such fornication, as is not so much as named among the Gentiles," (1 Cor. i. 11 ; iii. 3 ; v. 1 ;) yet says, and that without exception, that they had all "been made to drink into one Spirit."

"If then words mean anything, and the plain letter of Scripture is to be regarded, *every* baptized person, no matter what his character before, at, or after baptism, did at that time of his regeneration *imbibe the Holy Ghost*: it may be that this gift of God's free grace was well nigh or wholly dried up by the parching fever of sin which had not been allayed by penitence; or probably the flame of after-indulged lusts and passions consumed at length the copious draught, which, being at first received, awhile continued to refresh and to invigorate; or perhaps, absorbed by guileless infants, or by penitent, loving, obedient, and humble souls, It proved in them to be a 'well of water springing up into everlasting life' (S. John iv. 14): but whichever was the case, the fact remains that *all* equally *drank*, though *all* did not drink with *any* or with *equal benefit*."

Of those who are cut off, either by their own act, or by that of others, from all direct functional intercourse with the Episcopate, our author says, carrying on the analogy,—

"The division either by design or accident of a main artery (and consequently of its dependents) though imperilling the condition of that part of the body which it was designed to nourish, would not necessarily deprive it of nourishment, since every single artery, small or great, is supplied along its whole course with other connecting arteries which reach the main trunk by a route, however circuitous."

Lastly, and most painful, there is the case of that vast body of persons in all parts of Christendom, who being classed as Dissenters, are supposed not to belong in any sense to the Church, because they do not use the Apostolical ministry, "whereas," continues Mr. Perry, "the truer view of them would be that they are irregular or inconsistent Churchmen,"

"if the subject of *that* Baptism which has been all along assumed to join men to the Church, *i.e.*, the Body of CHRIST. What pretence of communion, it will be asked, can be urged for these, seeing that at least they are not in the position of those who *cannot*, but of those who *will not* have recourse to that means of grace which has ever been accounted as Divinely ordained for a Christian man's spiritual sustenance?

"To this it may fairly be replied—that it is important to consider how far the *unwillingness* alleged may be *their own fault*. Where indeed it can be shown to be such an innate perversity of the will as amounts to an obstinate persistence in what, after sufficient instruction and warning they must know to be contrary to the Will of CHRIST; then it is enough to say—that these must be catalogued with 'ungodly and with sinners,' acknowledged to be such in those parts of the Church where the organization is the most complete. But when it is remembered what has been, nay is, the condition of the Mystical Body, who will venture to affirm that the state of the class of persons in question is not due to the manifest and manifold failings and corruptions of the Church which itself contains them! Who, too, that reflects upon this, will not wish to avoid defining what is sufficient instruction and warning for

such, lest he incur the Apostolic rebuke as to lesser matters—"Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea he shall be holden up; for GOD is able to make him stand." (Rom. xiv. 4.)

"Is it not true of them, as it is true of the natural body—that the disease of any part endangers or destroys the soundness of every part which surrounds it? But as no one could truly declare any portion of the human body to be *inorganic* because it had not been vitally injured by the disease of a contiguous part, so it would be at least presumptuous to assume that these non-conforming Christians hold no actual communion with the Church of CHRIST, because they do not exhibit *all* the *acknowledged* notes of fellowship. The real point to be considered is—if subjective faith and true holiness of life are found, as indeed they are found, in such a number of those who stand aloof from the appointed channels of heavenly nourishment, whence springs their undeniable grace? I answer that it comes of their real incorporation with the Body of CHRIST, and is due to a law which regulates that Body."

In the case of unbaptized persons, such as Quakers or others, wrongly called Christians, who exhibit religious conduct and moral qualities, not easily distinguished from grace, it may be objected that the analogy is imperfect. The author answers—

"But such an argument would have been of equal force if applied to the Apostolical Christians and Cornelius the heathen. Moreover, *contact* is effectual for good as well as for evil; and thus, *intercourse* with the Church, in any place may even effect more in those who have a *disposition* for grace, than *incorporation* does in such as lack this preparation: though this, so far from being a ground of satisfaction to those who are profited, is the very reason for their seeking a relation designed to confer higher blessings."

As we began by saying, the author has been most successful in this work which, though small, will be found useful for circulation. For in sustaining his theory, he has not in the least compromised the dogmatic truths of the Church. Without yielding one iota of Catholic doctrine, or practice, or discipline, he breathes forth charity to all those diseased and sickly members, who though acknowledging neither the doctrines, practice, nor discipline of the body, have, nevertheless, been all made to drink "into one Spirit," by Baptism.

Of those members who fall into wilful and deadly sin, and continue therein, nothing is said, (though a paralyzed limb is preserved from corruption, by remaining a part of the body natural) but of all those who being baptized, have a subjective faith in the necessary truths of Christianity—of these and all we would say with our author, let us be careful to endeavour "to restore such an one in the spirit of meekness."

Scripture Record of the Life and Times of Samuel the Prophet. By the author of "Scripture Record of the Blessed Virgin, Mother of our LORD." Rivingtons.

THIS volume is evidently intended for the young. The "History of the Times of the Prophet," is written in an interesting style, and the personal life and prophetic character of Samuel, are blended with reverence. We think, however, that Samuel is treated by the author, too much as a direct type of CHRIST, and consequently his individual character forms the chief subject of this little book. We regret amidst so much that is instructive, the absence of a clear definition of the

prophet's office. No allusion whatever is made to the perpetuation of that office in the representatives of CHRIST; but the author leaves the reader to infer that it became extinct in the Church, when our LORD took upon Himself the threefold office of Prophet, Priest, and King. But it would have been to little purpose that those offices were united in CHRIST, if He had not secured the continuation thereof, in His Apostles and their successors. "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high," (S. Luke xxiv. 49;) power to speak in GOD's Name, power to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice, power to rule the kingdom of CHRIST on earth.

Again, we cannot but express our disapproval of the indiscriminate way in which Christians, heathen, and infidels, are classed together by the author. In speaking, for instance, of the raising of Samuel at Endor, he says, "When we consider that all the pretended revelations given to the world, including the Koran, the Talmud, and the traditions of the Romish Church, are filled with apparitions and communications from the world of spirits; this one exception, found in the whole Bible, must be received as a proof that the 'land beyond this sable shore,' is indeed a 'bourne from whence no traveller returns.'" (Page 146.) Surely the traditions of any body of Christians, ought in no way to be compared with the pretended miracles of the Koran!

-
1. *Sermons for Saints' Days, preached in Clapham Parish Church.* By HENRY WHITEHEAD, M.A., Curate of Clapham. Bosworth and Harrison.
 2. *Sermons preached in the Chapel of S. Columba's College.* By CHARLES H. RICE, M.A., Fellow of S. John's College, Oxford, and Vicar-Choral of Armagh Cathedral. J. H. Parker.

THESE are both earnest and orthodox volumes, and the Sermons, we doubt not, were in each case appreciated by those who heard them. In Mr. Whitehead's there is a good deal of freshness and originality—qualities which have already made him popular as a lecturer—the defect is, that they are too exclusively subjective, and at times consequently rather fanciful. To our mind, "Saints' Days Sermons" should rather give a record of those outward historical acts by which the Church, through the instrumentality of the Apostles, was built up. The second sermon on the Conversion of S. Paul, while vindicating the Catholic interpretation of the seventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, shows with some ingenuity how the struggle which the Apostle there describes as going on in the minds of men who were waiting for CHRIST's coming, is practically renewed in the minds of many imperfect Christians.

Mr. Rice's Sermons, like the foregoing, if wanting somewhat in definiteness, are well calculated to conciliate confidence in an unfavourable locality. The last, headed "Church Principles," is perhaps the most outspoken; but the one contrasting Esau and Judas Iscariot is the most striking in the volume. We should have been glad to have seen some little account from the author of S. Columba's College—an institution which commands all our sympathies in its behalf.

The Rev. C. S. GRUEBER, who has taken an active part in several of our past controversies, has written a *Letter* to Archdeacon Denison, in the chief features of which we quite agree. His main principle is, that of all remedies which have been suggested in reference to this avowedly difficult subject, the worst would be the making the Service vague and general, by removing all reference to the individual. He also alludes, though tenderly, to the real cause of the difficulty, viz., the absence of any direct commendation of the soul to the mercy of Almighty God.

For ourselves, we have already said, that we dare not advocate a revision of the Service; but as the subject is discussed in various quarters, we may mention, what would seem to us to be the simplest and most satisfactory arrangement, inasmuch as it involves the addition of no new prayer, nor the alteration of any one now existing, *supposing revision to be attempted*. It would be,

1. The addition of another antiphon, "Enter not into Judgment," and leaving the choice of the antiphons, as at the commencement of the Daily Office, optional.

2. A second optional Lesson, say 2 Cor. ii. 2—15, or 1 Thess. v. 1—11.

3. Leaving *all* at the grave optional, except the Lesser Litany, and the LORD's Prayer, and the Grace of our LORD. In this way, there would soon cease to be any stereotyped form in use, and invidiousness therefore would consequently cease.

A really excellent Service would be made, by using,

1. "Man that is born of a woman."

2. "Forasmuch as,"—to "dust to dust."

3. "LORD, have mercy upon us."

4. The LORD's Prayer.

5. "The Grace of our LORD."

And if to this were more often added a Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, with a part of the "Dies Iræ" for an introit, the Church would be in all ways a gainer.

Mr. Grueber considers the true remedy to lie in the restoration of discipline. Undoubtedly this, if *exercised on men during their life time*, is much to be desired, and would meet some of the more flagrant cases, that occur from time to time, which the Bishop of Oxford considers may even now be met satisfactorily. But would it meet all cases? We think not.

Christmas Tales, (Longman and Co.,) is the first of a remarkably cheap series, entitled, "The Shilling Entertaining Library," edited by Mr. Laurie, which promises to afford no small gratification to the children of the present day. The editor starts on the principle, that children in their play hours ought to be provided with that which will afford them real though harmless amusement, instead of endeavouring to palm off unpalatable instruction, under a flimsy disguise of agreeable reading. In this object he is sure to succeed, as he provides good, honest, fairy tales and others, which appeal to the imagination, and his little book, strongly bound for mischievous hands, is enriched with some capital engravings.

A Word to all on Christmas Day, (Skeffington,) is well intended and, if not striking, unobjectionable.

Chapters on Plants; or, Marion's Herbal, (Masters,) is one of the most useful and interesting little books of its sort and size, we remember to have seen. It contains really a great deal of general information for children, geographical and historical, as well as botanical,—and it has the additional merit of being Catholic. The pretty, and well-selected poems, and anecdotes, which occur in the conversations between Marion and her uncle, are very pleasing. From the chapter on the Rose, we give an extract :

“Poets are crowned with bays, victors with laurel! In Salency, a small village in Picardy, there still remains an interesting and a highly useful and moral custom, it is called ‘The Festival of the Rose.’ On a certain day of every year the young women of the village assemble. After a solemn trial, before competent judges, the one who has conducted herself most discreetly, and gives the most affecting proofs of the general innocence and simplicity of her character, is decorated with a crown, which thenceforth becomes an object of pride to all her family. This crown is a hat covered with a wreath of roses. This custom was instituted by S. Médard in the fifth century. He was the proprietor of the village, and his sister the fortunate winner of the original prize. Up to the Revolution this festival was observed with all the circumstances of preparation and solemnity that marked its institution thirteen centuries before. Louis the Thirteenth sent the Marquis de Gardes, from Varennes to Salency, with presents of a blue ribbon and a silver ring for the Queen of the Rose; and in 1776 a French gentleman, M. de Morfontaine, settled one hundred and twenty livres on the annual winner of the rose.”

Should any of our readers have the misfortune to find those for whom they are responsible, assailed by Roman controversialists, they cannot do better than put into the hands of such persons a tract by the Rev. H. J. PYE, Rector of Clifton Campville, entitled, *The Claims of the Roman Catholic Church*. (Rivingtons.) Our position in reference to that Church, as Mr. Pye shows, may be summed up in these two propositions: 1. No essentially Roman doctrine existed in the Church for more than a thousand years; and 2. Since that date the Church has been divided, and *could* not therefore decree any new doctrine.

Women labouring in the Lord, (J. H. Parker,) is the title of an excellent and most characteristic Sermon, preached by Mr. KEBLE, at the recent anniversary of S. Mary's Home, at Wantage.

Mr. LONGSDON's *Remarks on the Management of the S.P.C.K.* (Mozley,) certainly savour somewhat of personal pique. We believe, however, that good will come of the publication. It is a startling statement, for example, that the sale of Bibles by the Bible Society last year, was more than fourfold greater than the sale of the S.P.C.K., and that the issue of tracts by the Religious Tract Society was nearly ten times as numerous.

The Chapel of the Spanish Embassy has been remarkable for anything but pure music. We gladly therefore welcome an *Ancient Carol*, harmonized by Mr. FAGAN, its organist, according to the First Gregorian Mode, (Lambert and Co.) We trust it is an augury that our Roman Catholic brethren are returning to a severer style of music. The melody is also ancient, and well suited to the words.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

REV. SIR,—Will you allow me space for a few lines to correct a mistake, as to a matter of fact, which concerns me in the review of my Donnellan Lectures, in your October Number.

Alluding to my "Hebrew and Greek Concordances," the reviewer says that "the heavy cost of so large a work compelled me to entrust it [for publication] to an eminent and wealthy member of the Plymouth sect." It is quite true that the gentleman in question did volunteer to publish it at his own risk, but he was not then a member of that body.

It is also due to him to say, in correction of the statement that he "appropriated the name and fame, and the gains which must ultimately be very great," that I have been informed, that he has determined on giving the whole profits to missionary purposes, there being no agreement between us as to the proceeds, further than that he should reimburse himself his large outlay. Of this, indeed, I feel I have cause to complain, especially as he is aware that my appointment, after thirty-five years' service, is only a small perpetual curacy; as also that my name as author does not appear in the proper place on the title, (with his, if he pleased, as editor,) for which he assigns as reason, that it is contrary to his present principles to affix "Reverend," or any collegiate degree of divinity, to an address.

I am very respectfully yours,

W. DE BURGH, D.D.

*Sandymount, near Dublin,
Nov. 4, 1863.*



